

T W O  
EXERCITATIONS.

The First attempting to demonstrate that the  
*Jews* till after the return from the Captivity of *Babylon*,  
were not allowed the publick and-promiscuous use of  
the Canonical Books of the Old Testament.

The Second concerning the true pronounciation  
of the *Tetragrammaton*, or four lettered Name of God a-  
mong the *Jews*; As also concerning the Pythagorick  
*Tetractys* and other Philological matters that have a  
connexion with it.

B E I N G

The Second and Last Part of the *Digression*,  
In the *Additions* to the

S E R M O N

Before Sir P. W.

By JOHN TURNER,  
Late Fellow of *Christ's College* in *Cambridge*.

Πάθος ἡμῶν μαρτύριον.

*Cuncta prius tentanda, sed immedicabile vulnus  
Ense recidendum est, ne pars sincera trahatur.*

L O N D O N,

Printed for *Walter Kettilby* at the Bishop's Head in St.  
*Paul's Church-Yard*. 1684.



TWO

# EXERCITATIONS

The first attempting to demonstrate that the  
the second demonstrating the other proposition  
the third demonstrating the other proposition

The fourth demonstrating the other proposition  
the fifth demonstrating the other proposition  
the sixth demonstrating the other proposition

FINIS

The seventh and last part of the dissertation  
in the which we see the

# SERMON

Preached at the funeral of the late

JOHN TOWNSEND  
Pastor of the Church of the Holy Trinity in New York

By the Rev. Mr. John T. Townsend  
Pastor of the Church of the Holy Trinity in New York

At the funeral of the late  
John T. Townsend, Pastor of the Church of the Holy Trinity in New York



---

---

Reverendo admodum Patri,

E T

Prænobili Viro,

**HENDERICO,**

Volente Faventæque Deo,

Antistiti *LONDINATUM*, &c.

*JOHANNES TURNER* Voti,

Ex aliqua sui parte, nondum soluti reus,

Quod erat residuum pernumerans

Et persolvens, Fidem liberat & voto liberatur.

Reverendo atheniensi Patri,

A T

Præfidi Viro,

**HENDERICO,**

Volente Faventeque Deo,

Atheniensi LONDINATUM, &c.

JOHANNES TURNER Vos,

Et alios sui patri, mandavit scribi.

Quod erat reliquum permutatis

He perfolvens fidem libere se vos libere

T H R

A

# PREFACE TO THE READER.

**I**F the usefulness of these Discourses will not speak their Apology, notwithstanding they are soe little of kin to any thing of a Sermon, which was the onely occasion of their writing, then I shall be at a loss for any other defence, and must submit upon discretion to the censures of my Readers, who are my proper Judges, and from whose sentence there lies no farther remedy or appeal.

I did not till very lately intend to publish the first of these Discourses, but because I find I have referred to it in the latter, (if it may be called the latter, for they are indeed all but one, and the reflexion upon this will doe a kindness to several passages which may otherwise seem absurd.) therefore I have perswaded it to come abroad, lest otherwise you might think me to be haunted with se-

verish

## *The Preface to the Reader.*

verish Apparitions, and to refer to things that were not in *rerum natura*, or lest you should chance to loose your way when you are so obligingly disposed as to design me a Visit, and enquire for *More-fields*, instead of *St. Thomas*, mistaking one sort of Hospital for another.

I have nothing farther to add, but that if you will pardon these digressions for this once, I will engage to you solemnly and *verbo sacerdotis*, which was a very sacred way of plighting Faith, before the discovery of the *Popish-Plot*, to be more close and pertinent for the future; and if what I have done already may have the good Fortune to meet with candid acceptance, it will give me encouragement as well to finish with chearfulness and Vigour, what is now upon my hands, as to launch out farther into new designs, for the improvement of Learning, and for the good of the World.

*Farewell.*

---

**T**HE first Exercitation being but very short, and having but few particulars, needs no particular Enumeration of the Contents. The Contents of the Second are as follows.

T H E

# THE CONTENTS.

**A** Ben Ezra accusing the Samaritans of Worshipping  
Ashima, is guilty either of an Equivocation or a  
downright falsehood, Pag. 199.  
Ashima, what, ib.

*The Secret of the Tetragrammaton not unknown to Christ  
according to the Authour of Toledoth Jeshu, which  
seems to be confirmed by a testimony of Suidas, but no-  
thing can be safely affirmed or denied upon such testi-  
monies as these,* 200

*Our Saviour could not belong properly to the Aaronical or  
Jewish Priesthood, being not descended of the Tribe of  
Levi, otherwise than by the Mother's side,* ib.

*The Testimony of Philo Judæus concerning the Tetragram-  
maton produced, and proved from it that Philo Judæus  
had not read the Original Book of Moses himself, upon  
which that Testimony pretends to rely,* 200, 201.

*The Testimony of Josephus concerning it produced,* 201.

*From whence it appears plainly that Josephus was not ac-  
quainted with the four lettered name of God, as that name  
is represented in its Hebrew form and appearance,*  
202.

*Quæstiones in the citation of Josephus are Vowels properly  
so called in opposition to Consonants, or mute and unsoun-  
ding Letters proved against Jos. Scaliger,* ib.

*The name of God according to Josephus in this place can  
be nothing else but יהוה.* ib.

*A Second place of Josephus concerning the ineffable or un-  
utterable name of God,* 202, 203.

## The Contents.

- Two Reasons why it came to be so great a secret even among the Jews themselves,* 203.
- First Reason, the General Reverence which hath prevailed in all Nations for the name of God, in so much that even among the Heathens themselves they were used to omit his name even at that very time when they Swore by it, saying onely in an Elliptical way, Mā 7 and 7. Pindar, Aristophanes, and the Anthology explained,* 203, 204.
- The Second Reason, of the Jewish ignorance of this Sacred name to be taken from the Version of the 70. who have rendered it by Κύριος without any where mentioning the name it self,* 204, 205.
- But though Josephus were himself ignorant of the true Pronunciation of this name yet from what he hath said there is sufficient light afforded to discover it,* 205, 206.
- The Second Testimony of Josephus resumed, and that he speaks there of the Ehjeh Asher Ehjeh, which was that name of God in which Moles delivered his Message to the King of Egypt,* 206.
- יָהוּ ib.*
- The same with Ehjoh, which is afterwards proved to have been the old punctation,* 207.
- יָהוּ bath but three Letters whereas Ehjoh hath four, and why,* ib.
- The reason given for it confirmed by the Authority of Bochartus in a resembling instance,* ib.
- Neither the Javoh of Bochartus nor the Jahoh of St. Jerome were the true and ancient pronounciation of the Tetragrammaton,* 207.
- Which is still farther confirmed,* 208.
- Ad calcem pag.*
- The Tetragrammaton consisted exactly of the same Letters in St. Jerome's time with 777 of our Masorethical Bibles, and that the Procopian 7777 read backwards according*

## The Contents.

- ding to the Eastern mode, in the same, p. 207, 208.  
*The interpretation of  $\lambda\alpha\upsilon$ , as it is corruptly read for  $\lambda\alpha\gamma$ ,  
in Clemens Alex. answers to that Etymon of it which I  
have assigned, p. 208.  
The particular reasons assigned why neither Bochartus his  
Etymon of  $\lambda\alpha\upsilon$ , nor that of St. Jerome, are to be ad-  
mitted, ibid.  
As  $\lambda\alpha\upsilon$  is Ehjoh, so is  $\lambda\delta\omega$  Jehvoh, and this is that name  
of God expressed in Greek characters which Josephus  
affirms to have consisted of  $\tau\omega\alpha\epsilon\gamma\ \phi\omega\upsilon\eta\upsilon\lambda\alpha$ , four Vowels,  
209.  
 $\lambda\alpha\upsilon$  is from Hajah, with a Jod,  $\lambda\delta\omega$  from Havah, with a  
Vau, both signifying the same thing, ibid.  
 $\text{O } \omega\upsilon, \delta\ \nu\iota\epsilon\upsilon\theta, \nu\iota\phi\omega,$  for  $\epsilon\iota\upsilon\lambda, \iota\epsilon\alpha\phi\chi\omega,$  ibid.  
The punctuation of the future tense of Havah and Hajah, by  
a Cholem instead of a Segol, very ancient, as is pro-  
ved by several instances out of Plautus his Pænulus,  
209, 210.  
The affinity, and in a manner sameness, of the Hebrew  
and Punick Language, ibid.  
Several other considerations to confirm the same punctuation  
and first, from the testimony of a place of Theodoret,  
210, 211.  
The punctuation by a Cholem is confirmed by the custome of  
the Ancients in their adoration of a Sneeze, Xenophon  
and Plato explained, 247.  
A Sneeze why used and consulted in Divination, the An-  
thology, Propertius, Catullus, explained, 247, 248.  
A third reason by which the same punctuation is confirmed  
taken from the seven lettered name of God in the Oracle  
and in the Anthology, 249.  
Scaliger mistaken in several instances, ibid.  
The seven lettered Name of God so called by the mistake  
and ignorance of the Greeks was the  $\text{IET}\Omega$  and the  
 $\text{IA}\Omega$  joined together, ibid.  
*This**



## The Contents.

<i>This conjecture farther vindicated against a possible exception, and the gross error of Bochartus discovered,</i>	249, 250.
<i>God is not onely called Ehjoh and Jeh voh but Jah, which was a name of God as sacred, peculiar and incommunicable as the other,</i>	250.
<i>Proved out of Symmachus, the quinta Editio, and the LXX. themselves in their ἀδελφία, that this was the ancient and true punctation,</i>	ibid.
<i>It is owing to the same root with the other two, and its analogy cleared,</i>	ibid.
<i>An objection against the punctation of the name Jah considered and answered,</i>	251.
<i>The place of Theodoret farther considered,</i>	ibid.
<i>Ἀνὰ, ἰὰ, the error of Hæschelius,</i>	ibid.
<i>Zā, Ζυῖς, Jugum, Ζῆλῶ, jaloux, jealous, Pherecydes Syrius explained,</i>	ibid.
<i>Ἰαῖ and ἰαῖ in Alexander Trallianus, whence,</i>	251, 252.
<i>Pharaoh, Pharaoh, Pharaohes, Phraates,</i>	ibid.
<i>Abraxas, the God of the Basilidians, who, and why so called, and the Abracadabra in Serenus Sammonicus explained,</i>	252.
<i>Zav, Ζυῖς, Ζαῖς, Ζαῖ, Juno, ἰῶ, what and whence,</i>	253.
<i>Ἰαῖχῶ, from Jah, Jupiter, q. Jouipiter, from the Imperative Joh, the same with Jah, the conjecture of Cicero, Agellius and Lactantius concerning the name Jupiter rejected,</i>	ibid.
<i>As also the Jovis pater of the Moderns,</i>	ibid.
<i>Ζῆναιος,</i>	254.
<i>Lucilius explained, and the reading of the present Copies vindicated against Mr. Selden and Doufa,</i>	ibid.
<i>Nomen in Lucilius what,</i>	ibid.
<i>Pater and Genitor the common Epithet of all the Heathen Gods,</i>	254, 255.
<i>Apollo, why so called,</i>	255.
	Apella,



## The Contents.

Apella, Ἀπελλάς, Horace explained,	ibid.
Baal Peor the same with Priapus according to St. Jerom and Isidore,	ibid.
But this not approved by Mr. Selden,	256.
The true Etymon of Priapus proved out of Isidore, and the false one of Dionysius Vossius refuted,	255, 256.
Priapus why made to preside over Ports as well as Gar- dens,	ibid.
Ἀποδῶν, who,	ibid.
Salax, whence,	ibid.
Portunus, Neptunus, à portubus, navibusque tuendis, ib.	
Νηὶδὴν, vox nihili, and the conjecture of Plutarch concern- ing the Etymon of Neptune rejected,	ibid.
Ναῦς and Νάυς, Navius and Nevius the same name, ibid.	
The Heathen Deities not onely called Patres and Genitores, but also ἀνακτες, Reges, and both of these comprehended in the Tetragrammaton of the Hebrews, and in the Κερα of the LXX.	257.
But the title of Ἀναξ most proper to the supreme Numen, or him who was accounted the Sovereign of the Gods, ibid.	
Molech, Moloch, Milcom, Anamelech, Adramelech, who, and why so called,	ibid.
Annibal, Asdrubal, whence,	ibid.
Adrumetum and Atramyttium, as much as Adir Mor, and the conjectures of Drusius, Isaac Casaubon and Bo- chartus himself exploded,	from 257 to 260.
Μῶρ, in the Phenician Language the same with the En- glish Mud,	258.
It is made probable from Bochartus that the Phenicians traded hither, and the name Britain is originally Pu- nick,	ibid.
The mistake of Bochartus as to the signification of the Hebrew word Chatfar,	258, 259, 260.
Adir, a Phenician word, proved from Priscian and Saint Austin.	260.

## The Contents.

- Philo Judæus vindicated against Joseph Scaliger, and the word *Más* or *Mór* farther explained, 260, 261, 262.
- Πάλς*, palus, 261.
- Tehom, *Ἰβουρ*, what; ibid.
- The mistake first of Philo Judæus, and then of the Jewish Rabbins, as to the Etymon and signification of Cherub, or Cherubim discovered, and the true meaning of that word vindicated and explained, 262, 263.
- Another indication of the punctuation of the Digrammaton by a Cholem, from the *lo* of the Latines, and the conjecture vindicated from the inscription upon the Numisma of Abraxas, together with a farther confirmation of my conjecture concerning the seven lettered Name of God, 263.
- Mr. Selden's conjecture concerning Juba the Mauritanian God confirmed, and shewn how by analogy it may be reduced to the Tetragrammaton, or indeed is of it self the same with it, 263, 264.
- Ζῶς* and *Δεός* or Deus the same; 264.
- The Tetragrammaton no such secret among the ancient Jews, as it hath been usually represented to be; proved from Mr. Selden, 264, 265.
- Neither was the name Jehvoh only known to the Gentile World, but also that of Ehjoh too, being both of them from the same root, 265, 266.
- The Rabbins beholding to the Septuagint for their punctuation of Jehvoh by the points of *Ἰαδωαί*, 266.
- The superstition of the LXX. themselves in not delivering these names of God; viz. Jehvoh, Ehjoh, and Jah, by their own proper Letters and Vowels, *ἱαδωαί*, ibid.
- The Tetractys of the Pythagoreans, not the same with the Tetragrammaton of the Jews, ibid.
- No mystery in the number Four, nor any thing more incommunicably sacred in the name Jehvoh, than in that of Ehjoh or Jah, 267.
- The

## The Contents.

*The Rabbins called the incommunicable name אֱלֹהִים, Shem Shel Arbah Othijoth, but this was borrowed by them from the Greeks, who understood it, as hath already been proved, onely of אֱלֹהִים, that is to say, of that name as revealed to the Gentile World, not as kept secret from it,* 267.

*The time of Pythagoras compared with that of Sanchuniathon, and shewn that so long before his time, as the latter was elder than the former, the name אֱלֹהִים was no such secret even to the Gentile World.* ibid.

*Nay that it was much earlier abroad than the time of Sanchuniathon, who was contemporary with Gideon, is proved from what hath been said before,* 268.

*Nothing but want of skill in Grammar which made the Tetragrammaton and the Tetractys confounded together,* ibid.

*The Tetractys explained what it is,* 268, 269.

*And that explanation confirmed out of a place of Lucian in his Συμμιχτικόν.* 269.

*The analogy and reason of the word τετρακτύς explained and demonstrated out of a place of Homer, and the meaning of the τετρακτύς in the Pythagorick School,* 269, 270.

*The Pythagoreans swearing by their Tetractys, no argument that it was the same with the Tetragrammaton,* ibid.

*The number four, as hath been already declared, had no mystery among the Jews, and the name Tetragrammaton invented by the Greeks long after the time of Pythagoras, so that he could not allude to it,* 271.

*Neither did the Jews ever swear by the number Four, but Seven, and why,* ibid.

*Nishbah, Shebouah, what they signifie, and several Passages belonging as well to the History as Dispensation of the Jews explained from this observation,* 271, 272.

*Particularly the reason of the Rite of Circumcision is from thence:*

## The Contents.

- reason largely explained, and the opinion of Grotius  
consulted, together with that of Maimonides, with whom  
Grotius concurs in his judgment, both being beholding  
to a passage in Aristotle, who giving the reason why chil-  
dren among the Greeks were usually named upon the se-  
venth day, was himself very grossly and palpably mista-  
ken,* from 272 to 275.
- *And what it signifies in the old Scholiast upon Ho-  
mer, shewn by comparing it with that upon Apollonius,  
the Writer of the Argonauticks,* 275, 276.
- My notion of the Tetractys further confirmed,* 276, 277.
- The Pythagoreans were used also to swear by their Master  
Pythagoras, as believing him from the Stories which he  
related of himself, and which were told concerning him to  
be a divine and self-existent person, and how ridiculous  
and impossible those Stories were,* 277, 278.
- The same was likewise true of Empedocles, Epimenides,  
and Abaris, three Disciples and followers of Pythago-  
ras, that they also pretended to Divinity as well as he,*  
278, 279.
- And of Apollonius Tyaneus, a profest Pythagorean, who  
lived long after them in the time of Domitian,* *ibid.*
- And had the honour afterwards to be worshipped in the La-  
rarium of Alexander Severus,* *ibid.*
- The symbolick meaning of Pythagoras his golden Thigh con-  
sidered,* from 279 to 292.
- The Thigh a symbol of fruitfulness and generation, proved  
out of Heinsius in his Aristarchus,* 279, 280.
- Bacchus thence said to have been taken out of Jupiter's  
Thigh, that is no more than to be the son of Jupiter:  
ἀεξισμός, ἀεξισμός, the ignorance and pedantry of  
the Greek Grammarians,* 280, 281.
- Two places of Scripture proposed concerning Eleazar's laying  
his hand upon the Thigh of Abraham, and Joseph upon  
that of Jacob by way of adjuration, together with the  
reasons*

## The Contents.

- reasons of this custome assigned by Sebastian Munster,*  
*R. Salomon, Aben Ezra, P. Fagius, and H. Grotius,*  
 281, 282.
- An account why Munster's reason is insufficient,* 282.
- R. Salomon mistaken in matter of fact,* 282, 283.
- The reason of Aben Ezra perfectly precarious and without  
 any shadow of ground, and that of P. Fagius, besides  
 that it is precarious as the former, not comprehensive e-  
 nough to give an account of the universal obtaining of this  
 custome in all the Eastern Countries,* 283, 284.
- Besides the authority of Aben Ezra there is a citation pro-  
 duced out of Busbequius to prove that this custome did  
 universally prevail, and that it is still in use among the  
 Turks in the civilities of conversation. From the citati-  
 on of Busbequius in concurrence with Aben Ezra three  
 observations are raised: 1. That the laying the Hand  
 upon the Thigh was all over the East accounted a token  
 of high respect: 2. That the outward expressions by ge-  
 sture of civil respect and divine worship are the same,  
 being generally the same in all Ages and Nations: 3. The  
 mistake, or as it seems wilfull error of Josephus in re-  
 lating the story of Abraham and Eleazar is represented,  
 and a warning given not to rely too securely upon his autho-  
 rity without farther testimony from the probability of  
 things and the concurrence of other Writers, especially  
 the sacred and canonical, from 284 to 288.*
- The reason assigned by Grotius for this custome considered  
 and refused,* 288.
- The true reason of this custome explained, that it includes  
 an appeal to the maker of all things, the first cause of all  
 vital fecundity, and in whom as in the common Parent,  
 the seeds of all other vitalities or existencies are con-  
 tained, and as in religious worship it includes an appeal,  
 an invoking or an imprecation, so in civil conversation  
 it includes a prayer to the same being, in whom are the  
 issues.*

## The Contents.

- issues of life and death, for the health and safety of that person to whom this respect is paid, which was the reason also in civil salutation of laying the hands to the breast, by way of appeal to the searcher of hearts that we do inwardly wish the health and peace of our Brother to whom we address our selves with this formality of salutation,* 288, 289.
- The signification of Tachath in Hebrew, and of ~~ἱεὺς~~ in the Hellenistical Language reconciled to the present usage of the Turks of laying their hands upon, not under the Thigh,* 289.
- Several other places of Scripture produced to prove that the Thigh or the Knee, was a symbol of generation,* 289, 290.
- The reason of taking hold of the Knees in supplication. Τὴν-ζών, λαμβάνειν γούνα, &c. Seneca in Troade, explained,* 290, 291.
- The reason of bowing the Knee either in Divine Worship or civil conversation explained,* 291.
- All this applied to Pythagoras his golden Thigh, and it is extremely probable, if not absolutely certain, that the golden Thigh was intended for a symbol of Divinity, the fruitfulness of the Divine nature being denoted by the Thigh, and by its being made of Gold the stability and eternal firmitude of that fruitfulness was represented,* 291, 292.
- Pythagoras though he received not his Tetractys from the Jewish Tetragrammaton, yet is he not to be denied to have had some acquaintance with the Jewish Nation and affairs, and that he had considerable acquaintance with them both is probably asserted from the testimony of several Authours, and especially Porphyry in his Life,* 292, 293.
- Zabratus the Babylonian, Nazaratus, Zaran, Zaratas, Zaradas, all the same,* 293, 294.
- Abraxas, the God of the Basilidians, is in some Copies styled*



## The Contents.

- stiled Abraxan, but the former is the true reading, and why,* 293, 294.
- Zabratus as much as Jah Berith, the God of the Covenant and why so called,* 294.
- Why said to be a Babylonian,* 294, 295.
- In what sense Pythagoras may be said to have conversed with Zabratus, and of the likeness and resemblance betwixt the Doctrine of Pythagoras, delivered by Zabratus, and the Books of Moses, in three particulars,* 295.
- Of the dissimilitudes or disagreements betwixt Pythagoras and Moses, and the causes of it,* 295, 296.
- Sanchuniathon noted,* *ibid.*
- But it is not impossible that Zabratus might be the name of an Idol, the same with Bahal Berith in the Book of Judges, because the name Jah, though it be of right incommunicable and belonging onely to the true God, yet this hinders not but this might be applied by the Heathens to their Idols, because they took them to be such, and this, besides what is said afterwards concerning Zamolxis, may serve for a farther indication that the name Jah, which was every whit as incommunicable as the Tetragrammaton it self was no secret to the Heathen World,* 296, 297.
- Bahal Berith, Βασιλεις Βερυθω, unskillfully confounded with Abibalus, which was the name of the true God, being as much as El Abib, Deus Spicarum, so called from the change of the beginning of the Jewish Year from Tisri to Nisan, or Abib, the confusedness of Sanchuniathon's History is again perstringed,* 297.
- Four reasons assigned to strengthen my conjecture concerning Abibalus being the name of the true God,* *from* 297 *to* 300.
- Απαριθμηται, ἀνὰ τετρα, what,* 298.
- Μωσαϊ for Neptune, Mos or Moy for Water in the Ægyptian Language,* *ibid.*
- c
- 188d.

## The Contents.

- Used the same with Isaac, Annobret with Sarah, Ko<sup>ria</sup> with Rouach Elohim, or the spirit or breath of God in Sanchuniathon, for which three discoveries I acknowledge my self indebted to Bochartus,* 299.
- Notwithstanding the manifest Anachronisms, and other mistakes or impositions of Sanchuniathon, yet his agreements with Moses are a testimony to the truth of the Mosaick Writings,* *ibid.*
- Zamolxis the same with Jah Moloc,* 300.
- Much ancients than Pythagoras according to Herodotus,* *ibid.*
- Worshipped for Saturn according to Mnaseas in the Etymologist and Suidas, and this is a farther confirmation that Zamolxis and Moloc were the same,* *ibid.*
- Appeased also by humane Sacrifices as Moloc was,* 300, 301.
- Called Gebeleizin from a Hebrew Word which signifies as much as Terminus, or Jupiter Terminalis, O<sup>us</sup> ~~Termin~~ <sup>Termin</sup> ~~us~~, as Herodotus expressly calls Zamolxis,* *ibid.*
- Alagabalus, the tutelar of Emilla, whence he had his name,* *ibid.*
- Several other considerations to prove that Jah and Zamolxis are at least so far the same, as that the first is a part of the composition of the latter. First he was worshipped without an Image, and supposed to have his peculiar residence in Heaven, from whence God by the ancient Jews was called Shamajim, several places of Scripture are explained, and two passages of Herodotus,* 301, 302.
- Secondly, the Scythians believed of their Zamolxis that he was the true and only God, and that there was none besides him, which was the reason of their shooting up to Heaven whenever it thundered and lightning, in defiance of those Meteors, as insensible and dependent Creatures, though other Nations worshipped them for Gods,* 302, 303.
- Thirdly,*



## The Contents.

*Thirdly, The Scythians believed the transmigration of Souls, or the passing of the same Soul successively through several humane Bodies, but that this did not belong to all but onely to the good, both of which are asserted concerning them by Herodotus, and both of these opinions were received by the Jews themselves in our Saviour's time,* from 303 to 307.

*Συμμεταστάσεις, συμφορταῖς, αἱ μετ' αὐτῶν. Herodotus and Hel-  
lanicus explained,* 304.

*Porphiry's opinion concerning the Etymon and signification of the name Zamolxis considered and refuted,*

307, 308, 309.

*Zaleucus and Charondas, who they were, a possible Etymology of each of their names shewed with a detection of the vanity of each, and a caution to wariness in Etymologies, which afford so large a field for Fancy, with a discovery of the true analogy and signification of each of these names, which concludes this Discourse,* from 309 to 312.

---

THE



---

The First  
EXERCITATION,

*Attempting to demonstrate that the  
Jews, till after the Return from the  
Captivity of Babylon, were not allow-  
ed the publick and promiscuous use of  
the Canonical Books of the Old Testa-  
ment.*

**I**T is so far from being true, that every  
Jew in his private capacity was bound  
to transcribe one Copy of the Law, as  
the Rabbins would persuade us, that I  
can make it very probable if not abso-  
lutely certain that the Commonalty of the Jew-  
ish Nation neither had nor were permitted usu-  
ally to have any Copy of the Law for their own  
private reading, for all that long interval which  
happened from the time of Moses himself till after  
the return from the Captivity of Babylon in  
the times of Ezra and Nehemiah, and so much  
longer as till the version of the 70. was compleat-  
ed, and by degrees was brought into common  
use

use. My Reasons which make me think so are these that follow.

*First*, When it is said, *Deut. 11. 18, 19, 20.* *Thou shalt lay up these my words in your heart, and bind them for a sign upon your hand, that they may be as frontlets between your eyes, and ye shall teach them your Children, speaking of them when thou sittest in thine house and when thou walkest by the way, when thou liest down and when thou risest up, and thou shalt write them upon the door posts of thine house, and upon thy gates :* These words are to be explained of the *Decalogue* or *Ten Commandments*, not of the whole *Law of Moses*, as will appear by comparing this Chapter with the 34<sup>th</sup>. of *Exodus*, which is parallel to it, and therefore when it is said *vers. 20. Thou shalt write them upon the door posts of thine house and upon thy gates*, in the first place this literally taken of the whole *Law of Moses* or of the *Five Books* of which the *Pentateuch* consists is both *ridiculous* and *impossible*, *ridiculous* to think that *Posts* and *Gates* were the onely *sacred Volumes* then in fashion, and *impossible* that all the *Law of Moses*, in a legible character should be written in so small a compass; wherefore in the second place we are not to interpret this place of *writing*, or of *Posts* or *Gates* in the literal sense, but it is in allusion to the sprinkling of *Bloud* upon the *Posts* and *Lintels* of the *Israelitish* houses the night before their deliverance out of *Aegypt*, it is a command with a promise of happiness and safety

annex

annext to its performance, and is as much as to say, "if you observe diligently to obey me and keep my Commandments, you shall then be safe from any Evil or Judgment that may otherwise befall you, as your Ancestours were exempted from the slaughter of the First-born by the blood of the Paschal Sacrifices sprinkled upon the Posts and Thresholds of their houses; and such another allusion as this, is that saying of *Moses* to his *Maker*, *Exod. 32. 32. Tet now if thou wilt forgive their sin: and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast written.* And then *vers. 33. And the Lord God said unto Moses, whosoever hath sinned against me, him will I blot out of my book.* Not that we must entertain so gross and so unworthy conceptions of God Almighty, as if he entered down all humane or other Occurrences in a certain *Journal*, without which, if they did not escape his cognizance he would loose the memory of them, as if he kept an *Album Amicorum*, a Catalogue or List of his Friends and Favorites, without which they would slip out of his mind; but it is an allusion to the *Genealogical Tables* of the *Jews*, in which such as dyed without Issue, as being of no use in carrying on the series and account of time, were used by those who transcribed the *publick Genealogies* for the common use, or the *private Pedigrees* for the use of particular Families, to be omitted, and consequently in after Ages forgotten, of which I have spoken more largely in that *Disquisition*, which I have mentioned, concerning the *Brother's marrying the Brother's wife* in the *Levitical Law*; and this is plainly the meaning of that Passage, *Psal. 109. 13. Let his Posterity be cut off, and in the Generation following let their name be blotted out*; that is, when the *Genealogies* come to be transcribed for the use of the next Generation, let their names as barren and superfluous and dying without Issue be omitted.

Wherefore the Precept of *writing* of the *Law* or the *Commandments* upon the *Posts* and *Gates* of their houses, must be explained by *vers. 18. Ye shall lay up these my words in your heart and in your soul*, and this was that which they were to *teach their Children*, *vers. 19.* that is, not the *whole Law*, which those tender apprehensions could not receive or attend unto, much less comprehend the *entire* Systeme and Model of so intricate a Dispensation, but only the *general Rules of Life and Practice*, in which it was but requisite they should be trained up from their infancy and childhood, that the exercise and love of *Vertue and Religion* might be the more habitual to them in their age; and for this reason they were used to instruct them particularly in the *Decalogue*, as *Children now-a-daies* are used to be taught the *Apostles Creed*, the *Lord's Prayer*, and the *Ten Commandments*, which contain the *general Heads of Devotion*, *Articles of Belief* and *Rules of Practice*. The very-reducing the general Rules of duty both with respect to God and Man, under ten general Heads, the putting them not less than twice by themselves into Tables of Stone by the Finger of God himself, that is, by a supernatural operation of the Divine Will, notwithstanding there is nothing in the *Commandments* themselves, which is not more largely insisted upon in the body of the *Law*, and branched out into many particular cases, is a sufficient argument that these ten *Words or Precepts, or Commandments*, were intended for the use of the *Idiots*, or vulgar sort of men, to give them a *general Scheme* of their duty; though for their satisfaction in *particular cases*, whether of *religious scruple* or *civil right*, they were to betake themselves to the *Judges and Officers* of their respective Tribes, and from thence if they were not satisfy'd, they were to appeal to *Jerusalem*, in that manner which has been already declared.

Letters were so scarce in those early times among the *Jews*, as well as among other Nations, that to be able to write and reade, especially to reade the Law after the *traditionary way*, of which I shall speak more by and by, was that which qualify'd men for the highest employments in the *Jewish State*; and therefore it is observable that *Shoter*, and *Sopher*, and *Shophet* in *Hebrew* as they are names very like in sound, so they are also in signification, and were all of them frequently expressive of the highest power and authority among them. *Sophrim* and *Shophetim* are joyned together as *exegetical* and *declaratory* one of another, *2 Chron.* 34. 13. and so are *Shophetim* and *Shotrim*, *Deut.* 16. 18. In the first of which places the *Seventy* render it *γραμματεῖς καὶ κριταί*, *Scribes and Judges*; and in the latter they are termed *κριταὶ καὶ γραμματευσταγῶντες*, *Judges, and Promulgers of Judicial Edicts and Letters*, as *Andreas Masius* in his learned and elaborate Notes upon *Joshua* would have it, but by his favour, I do not allow that interpretation, but am rather of opinion that this word is *synonymous* with the former *κριταί*. For *κρουγῶν* is an *Introduction*, *κρουγῶντες* an *Introduitour* or *Instructour* in any Skill or Knowledge, and so *Plutarch* calls his little Book *μετὰ παιδὸν ἀγῶν*, that is, of the *instruction* or *information* of Youth; and so *γραμματευσταγῶντες* will be *interpretes, enarrator, Doctor Legis, an Expofitor* or *Teacher of the Law*, and consequently a Judge of those Controversies that were to be decided out of it; or it is one that was used to *bring out the Law among the People*, who were not allow'd the use of it, or could not make use of it at home, to reade and explain it, and address himself to them in practical and popular exhortations, as the People spake to *Ezra the Scribe*, *Neh.* 8. v. 1. *To bring the book of the Law of Moses*; and then v. 2. *And Ezra the Priest brought the Law before the Congregation.*



Neither were they onely by means of this skill of reading and interpreting the Law, capacitated to be the prime Judges and Officers among the People, but also by writing and keeping the *Genealogies*, which was no question another Imployment of theirs, they had opportunity of knowing all the People and of being better known to them, of understanding their qualities and conditions and serving themselves accordingly of them, and by being necessary to all conveyances and settlements of right between man and man, which will always be done in writing where such a thing as writing is to be found; they did by this means aggrandize and enrich themselves, and had a mighty stroke with their respective Clients, so that it is no wonder the *Scribes* are mentioned in the Gospel as men of so great authority and sway amongst the *Jews*, this being a name, for the reasons above given, of the greatest dignity and power among them, and so in the first of *Macchabees* the fifth Chapter and forty second verse, the *γραμματεῖς* ἡ λαὸς, the *Scribes of the people*, are manifestly the *Leaders* and the *Chiefs* among them, and *Acts* 19. 35. he who in our Translation is called the *Town clerk*, a man of principal credit and authority among the People of that place, is in the original called *γραμματεὺς*, the *Scribe*; and though I am ready to grant that this word does not always denote so much, but that sometimes the more inferiour Officers, such as the *Latines* call *Litlores*, *apparitores*, *viatores*, *accenso*. are understood by it, which is I think *Mafius* his notion of *γραμματισταγραῖς*, yet that it sometimes and that very frequently in the Old, and always in the New Testament denoted men of the greatest credit and power among the *Jews*, cannot without great unskillfulness be deny'd.

A second reason from whence it may appear probable, that the ancient *Jews* were not permitted the use and reading of the *sacred Volumes* in their private persons or Families,



Families, is that a great part of it did not concern them, but was perfectly the business of the *Priests*, and of none but them; so that to instruct them in the knowledge of those things, with that accuracy and niceness with which it was requisite the *Priests* and *Levites themselves* should understand them, was but to fill their heads with a superfluous lumber, which was of no use to them, and was rather an hindrance than otherwise to their improvement in, and to their due attention to those practical Precepts in which they were chiefly concerned.

*Thirdly*, There were some things in the Law, the knowledge of which could serve to no other purpose but onely to be a perpetual temptation to transgress it, as men have usually an hankering after those things, which are with the greatest rigour and severity forbidden them; such was the consecration or composition of the *holy Ointment*, with which the Tabernacle and all its Vessels and Furniture and the Priests themselves were to be anointed, *Exod* 30: where after the enumeration of its ingredients from v. 22. to 32. it is added v. 32. 33. *Upon man's flesh shall it not be poured, neither shall ye make any other like it, after the composition of it: it is holy and it shall be holy unto you, whosoever compoundeth any like it, or whosoever putteth any of it upon a stranger, shall even be cut off from his people.* And the same is true likewise of the *holy Perfume*, whose ingredients are specified v. 34. of which it is said v. 37, 38. *And as for the perfume which thou shalt make, ye shall not make to your selves according to the composition thereof: it shall be unto thee holy for the Lord, whosoever shall make like unto that, to smell thereto, shall even*

be cut off from his people. Wherefore the knowledge of these two things in the *Levitical Law*, being, if not put in practice, useless, and being practised, not onely dangerous, but fatal and destructive, it is most likely that as well the ingredients of these two *holy Compositions*, as also the proportions of each, and the manner of tempering and mingling them one with another, was kept as a secret among the *Priests*, or known onely to him or them who ever they were to whom the composition of them belonged.

What hath been said of these two Instances, the same would be likewise true of what the *Greeks* call the *Tetragrammaton*, and the *Jews*, *Hasbem*, or *Shem Hameporash*, the name, or the *nomen explicatum*, the explained name, as it should seem by an *Antiphrasis*, because, if we will believe the generality of the *Jewish* Masters, it cannot be explained, which being onely to be pronounced with its true Vowels by the *High Priest* once a year, when he entred into the Holy of Holies, was therefore probably, if this be true, (to hinder it from being profaned) kept from the knowledge of all but him, or his immediate Successour in that high Employment; it is certain that at this day its true pronunciation is not known, and the *Masorethical Jews* either out of ignorance or superstition or both, are always used to point it either with the Vowels of *Adonai* or *Elohim*, but mostly of the former; nay so foolishly superstitious are they, that in the numbring of the Verses in the present *Hebrew* Bibles, when they come to the 15th verse of any Chapter, whose proper marks

are

are a *Jod* and an *He*, they always change them into a *Teth* and a *Vau*, counting it by *nine* and *six*, instead of *ten* and *five*, because the Letters by which the former two numbers are denoted, are two of those Letters of which the *Shem Hameporash* is composed.

He that would see more of the modern Superstition, may consult *Buxtorf* in his Learned *Synagoga*; and he that desires to be informed what admirable work the *Cabalistical* Triflers have made of this mysterious name may repair for satisfaction to Rabbi *Paulus Fagius*, who is to be spoke with at all hours of the day in the 28th of *Exodus* at the 30th verse.

A fourth reason then, which may be assigned, to make it appear that private persons among the *Jews* were not permitted the reading of the Law, may be taken from their so frequent relapsing to *Idolatry*; notwithstanding the Law was so passionately severe in its denunciations against that dreadfull sin, so frequent, so unwearied in its exhortations against it, and that the *seven Nations*, whose Land they came to possess, were rooted out from off the face of the earth for no other reason but this, or at least for none so much as this, for their *Idolatry* and *spiritual fornication*; it being impossible and absurd to conceive, if all the people had been sufficiently instructed in the Law (which Law at the same time they must be supposed to acknowledge to have been of divine inspiration, and that all the curses and blessings therein mentioned did and would certainly belong to the performance or violation of what that Law commanded); I say, it would be impossible and absurd in this case to think, that *Idolatry* should

should creep in so often as it did, without any noise or disturbance; for in all those revolutions in the *Jewish Church*, from the *Established Religion* to the worship of *Idols*, and to the abominations of the *Heathens* round about them, though there might be and were actually some few who did not bow the knee to *Baal*, or submit to those pollutions which were so inconsistent with the worship and honour due to the true and onely God; yet it is manifest the Crowd and generality of the People were generally swept away with it, as by an *Epidemical Distemper*, a certain *Plague* and *Murrain* of the mind.

And this fourth reason will borrow yet farther strength from these three considerations, each of which are alone sufficient, and much more all of them together to put the matter beyond all possibility of doubt or question.

First, If we enquire into the true reason from whence it came to pass, that the *Romish Church* in the Adoration of *Images* and *Reliques*, in the worship of *Saints*, and the sacrifice of the *Mass* hath been guilty of so vile and execrable *Idolatry*; besides an infinite number of the most foolish and ridiculous superstitions; that either the wit or the folly of man could invent; it is very plain, that the true and onely cause why the deluded World has submitted it self so tamely to be trampled upon and trodden under foot, in spite of common reason and common sense, and hath believed the grossest contradictions, as Articles of Faith; condescended to the most Contemptible and Apish Follies as parts of a Serious and Devout Worship,

ship, is ultimately resolved into their unacquaintance with the Scriptures, which as long as they were in common use among the people, so long the Christian Faith continued, as to the main, free from that foul degeneracy and corruption, to which it was afterwards for so many ages condemned, and under which so great a part of the Christian World is to this day so fatally oppress'd; but when once the *Greek* and *Roman* Tongues became from vernacular to be learned languages, when neither the Fountains themselves, nor their purest streams could be repaired to by the ordinary people, and in too many instances not by the *Priests* themselves, while Translations were either not thought of or not permitted; this gave occasion for ignorance and superstition, by insensible degrees to corrupt and adulterate Religion; and for the craft and wickedness of designing *Priests*, who gain by nothing more than by the credulity and superstition of ignorant and foolish men, to introduce those opinions and practices into the world, which it is hard to say, whether they were better fitted to promote the outward pomp and splendour, the secular interest and advantage of the *Romish Church* and *Clergy*, or more expressly contrary to the *positive* and *declared Revelations* of *Christ* and his *Apostles*; such as are the *sacrifice of the Mass*, *Prayers* and *Masses for the dead*, *denying the Cup* to the *Laiety* in the *Holy Eucharist*, and the *Celibate* of the *Clergy*, or *forbidding Clergy-men to Marry*: of which the first and third were intended to create a respect and reverence for the person of the *Priest*; the second to be a perpetual *Tax* and *Subsidy* upon the *Laiety*; the last to secure the grandeur and external pomp of the *Church*, and all of them to fill the peoples heads with such absurd and grossly superstitious opinions, as are the most effectual means for the promoting and perpetuating to future generations all these unwarrantable interests and designs.

Secondly,

Secondly, As unacquaintance with the Scriptures, which to the *Romish* Church are as a *talent hid* in a *Napkin*, or a *Candlestick* put under a *busbell*, was the true cause of that Universal Idolatry and Corruption which prevails among the deluded Votaries of that Communion; so on the other side the true reason why the Reformed Churches have shaken off that yoke of absurdities and abominations, why they have embraced a Religion more agreeable to nature, and more suitable to revelation, is to be referred to the *Holy Evangelists* and *Apostles*, speaking to every one of us, as they did to the multitude on the day of *Pentecost*, in his *own* proper *Idiom* and *Language*; which it is utterly impossible they should do, but they must at the same time discover plainly to the world, God's utter detestation of all such *Idolatrous* practices, and of all those absurd and unwarrantable opinions upon which those forbidden practices are founded.

But, thirdly, to bring the matter a little more home to the *Jews* themselves, if it be demanded why before the Captivity of *Babylon*, they were so *often* guilty of *Idolatry*, but *never* after it, as it is plain they were not; the true reason of this is, that soon after the established worship was again settled upon its old foundations by *Esdra*s and *Nehemias*; the Translation of the *seventy* was made out of the Original *Hebrew*, and from that time forward the Law was layed open both to the *Jewish* and the *Gentile* World.

And these three things, as I have said, which are matters of fact, and arguments drawn from experience, I take to be a plain and undeniable demonstration of the matter in question, that the ancient *Jews* were not permitted the reading of the Law for themselves, or in their respective families or persons.



This is the fourth reason, a fifth no less demonstrative than that is, shall be taken from the peoples calling to *Esdra*s, to bring out the *Book of the Law*, and of their having lost not only the memory of those *rites* and *usages* with which their solemn Feasts were to be observed, but of the very *Feasts* themselves; of their having lost their language in so great a measure, that *Esdra*s was forced not only to produce the Law, but to explain it to them, as I conceive, in the *Chaldean* or *Assyrian* tongue, which was then more familiar to them than their native *Hebrew*: All which it is utterly unconceivable how it should ever have come to pass, had it been the custom of every private person to transcribe the Law for himself, as the *Rabbins* and their *adherents* would make us believe, and to read it to his Children and Domestiques in his family; I say, it would have been impossible at this rate, that in so small a period of time (there being several who had seen the first Temple, who likewise returned again from the Captivity and saw the foundations of the second lay'd) so strange an ignorance, and so utter a forgetfulness of the whole Law should over-spread the whole Nation of the *Jews*. Inasmuch that it was the opinion of *Ireneus*, *Eusebius* and several other of the ancient Fathers, that the Law of *Moses* in this Interval was utterly lost, and that by a supernatural revelation it was renewed by *Esdra*s; nay, *Tertullian* in his book *de habitu Mulieris*, is so positive as to affirm it for a certain and undoubted truth, *Hierosolymis Babiloniâ expugnatione deletis, omne instrumentum Judaicæ literaturæ constat per Esdram esse restauratum*; "It is certain that after *Jerusalem* was demolished by the King of *Babylon*, all the "Monuments of the *Jewish* Learning or Law (which were now perfectly lost) were restored by *Esdra*s. Which opinion, as being grounded upon no other foundation, than that extreme ignorance of the people in the Law  
after

after the return from the captivity, and their importuning *Esdra*s to bring out the Book of the Law, may without any unwarrantable disrespect to antiquity be rejected, especially since I hope I may pretend to have given a better account of those matters, because it hath nothing precarious in it, which is the fault of this; for it does not follow, because *Esdra*s was desired to *bring out* the book of the Law, that therefore it was *revealed* to him by *inspiration*, but that he could not bring it out, unless he had it in possession is certain, which is all that I contend for.

Neither need we be so scrupulous of rejecting the testimony of the *Fathers* in this case, if we consider that the divine inspiration of the seventy Interpreters, and their exact jumping together, notwithstanding every man made his Translation apart, is asserted by every whit as strong, nay, a much stronger suffrage of antiquity than this of the *Septuaginta*, or supernatural illumination of *Esdra*s; nay, *Justin Martyr* tells us, that he himself saw *those very Cells*, in which this miracle of a Translation was wrought; and yet nothing in common sense is more plain, nothing that happened either yesterday or to day more known, than that *Justin Martyr* was imposed upon, and that all his *fellow suffragans* were mistaken; unless we will affirm that the Spirit of God was so, and put all the mistakes and over-sights of the 70 Interpreters, which after all that *Isaac Vossius* hath said in their defence, were very many, to the divine Spirit, either imposing upon all mankind, or being mistaken and deceived it self; either of which is almost equally absurd and blasphemous to suppose, because the first argues a pravity in his Will, the second an imperfection in his Nature, and by both the foundation of all certainty is destroyed, it being the same thing with respect to our faculties, which depend upon his skill and veracity for their truth, whe-



whether he be capable of being deceived himself, or be of such a fallacious and deceitfull nature, that he will make no scruple of imposing upon us.

Sixthly, It is to be considered, that this was the constant practice of the most remote antiquity among all nations, that the *Mysteries* of their Religion were usually locked up among the *Priests*, and kept from the knowledge of the common people, and they had either generally no writing at all but among the *Priests*, and such as was to be found in the *publick Records* or in the *sacred Volumes*, both of which were used to be kept in their *Temples*; or if they had any, yet it was a *distinct* character from that which the *Priests* and *Hierophantæ* used, which was unknown to the ordinary sort of men: so *Porphyræ* saith of *Sanchuniathon*, that he took his History, ἐκ τῶν κατὰ πόλιν ὑπομνημάτων καὶ τῶν ἐν ταῖς ἱεροῖς ἀναγεγραμμένων, *Out of the publick Records, and sacred Volumes laid up in the Temples*: And *Philo* saith, that he compared his History, τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀδύτων ὑπερθεῖσιν ἀποκρύφους Ἀμμωνίων γεγραμμένον *With the bidden or concealed Monuments of the Ammonites which were layd up in their Temples*; for so I rather chuse to translate Ἀμμωνίων, than as *Bochartus* doth of the *Idols of the Sun*, which are called in *Hebrew* *Chamanim*; for all men that understand any thing in these *Grammatical* affairs, do know very well that Ἀμμωνίως is a very *Analagous* word from Ἀμμὼν or Ἀμμείν to signify *one of that people or nation*; and I conceive that in this place it can, in *strict Analogy*, signify nothing else: So also *Diodorus Siculus*, speaking of the letters of the *Egyptians*, saith, they had two sorts in use among them, one which was the *publique* letter of the whole Nation, the other *peculiar* to the *Priests*, derived down to them successively from Father to Son, and kept secret among themselves.

*Laertius*, in the life of *Democritus*, giving a Catalogue of the Books which he wrote, among others mentions these two, *περὶ τῶν ἐν Μέρῳ*, and *περὶ τῶν ἐν Βαβυλῶν ἱερῶν χαραμμάτων*, of the sacred Characters in Meroe and Babylon.

And lastly, *Theodoret* in his *Questions* upon *Genesis*, *ἐν τοῖς ἑλληνικοῖς ναοῖς ἴδεν τινὰς ἑστάν χαρακτῆρας χαραμμάτων ὅς ἐστι χαρακτῆρες πεποιημένων* In the Græcian Temples there were certain peculiar characters, which were called *ἱερογραφία*, that is to say, the letters or characters of the Priests, where when *Bechartus*, from whom I have borrowed these Citations, would interpret *ἑλληνικοὶ ναοὶ* in a larger sense, for any *Barbarous* or *Heathen Temples*; it is certain that this is precarious, if it be not false, and that the more strict interpretation, by which *ἑλλῶν* in Greek is usually opposed to *βαρβαροῦ*, is the more likely to be true.

From hence it is that the *Greeks* are used to call that *secret learning* which is kept among the *Priests* by the name of *Μυστήρια*, the *Mysteries*; from the *Hebrew Sathar*, *latuit*, the Participle of which in *Hopbal* is *Mustar*, and from thence is the Greek *Μυστήριον* or *Μυστήριον*, applied afterwards peculiarly by the *Greek Fathers* to the consecrated Elements of the *Holy Eucharist*; for this reason, because the *Catechumens* themselves, and much more the *ἑτεροδοξοί*, those that were perfectly without the pale of the Church, were not admitted to see or know any thing of the solemn administration of that holy Supper; insomuch that in their Homilies or Sermons, or other Discourses, they never allowed themselves to talk plainly concerning it, that the knowledge of those secrets might not by any means be imparted to any, but such as were admitted into the most perfect order of Christians, and were in the strictest degree of fellowship and communion with the Church.

Where-

Wherefore when ever they had occasion to touch upon any thing of those holy rites, the knowledge of which was not permitted to any but the perfect Christian, they were used to speak of it only in very general terms, closing up their dark and general expressions with an *ἁγιος* *ὁ μακάριος*, that is, the initiated or the perfect Christians understand what I mean; and by the same *Analogy* with this, to observe that also, now it lies so fairly in my way, the *Turks* at this day are used to call those who are *Atheistically* given, or rather they are used to call themselves, (as arrogating a more extraordinary knowledge to themselves above their neighbours, only for being more ignorant and stupid than they are) the *Musarim*, that is, *ὁ ἀπυρρυσμῶν*, the profound or deep searchers into the nature of things, for *Sour* in *Hebrew* is *recessit*, and *Mousar* the *Participle* in *Hophal* is *qui in recessu latet*; and *Mousarin*, as I have said, are the profound and deep Philosophers of the times, as this sort of people usually account themselves, and laugh at all that are piously or seriously disposed, as a pack of silly, superstitious mortals frightened by publick tales, by clouts and scare-crows, the crafty inventions of *Priests* and *Politicians* to keep the world in awe.

Lastly, By the same *Analogy* it is that the *Turks* call themselves *Muslemen*, that is to say, the faithfull, the perfect or the elect, for *Shalem* is *perfectum*, *beatum esse*, and from thence in *Hophal* *Muslim*, and by the addition of a *Turkish* termination *Musleman* (as from the *Chalday* *Tirgem* is the *Turkish*, *Drogerman* for an *Interpreter*) is a perfect or blessed man, or a professor of the true Religion, in which appellation the *Mahometans* hug themselves, as their fellow *Predestinarians* among us are used to do, and learn to despise and hate the rest of Mankind.

Now if it be true, as I have made it appear, that this was the custom of all the ancient World, to keep their sacred Volumes locked up in the Temples, and concealed from the knowledge of the common people; if this were the custom of the *Ammonites* and the *Aegyptians*, both of them so near neighbours to the *Israelites*, then these two things seem pretty plain.

First, If you add this general custom to what hath been said before to prove that the *common Jews* had little or no acquaintance with their law, I hope all this, taken together, will at least strengthen what former proof hath been given, if it may not pretend to be a new proof by it self.

Secondly, If we should suppose that the *Jews* had generally that familiar knowledge of, and acquaintance with the law which is denied, what extreme madness and folly would it have been in this case for them to relapse to the Idolatries and Superstitions of the Heathen World, that is, to run out of the light of noon, into the darkness of midnight, to leave a Religion which they perfectly understood, and were not capable to be abused by the craft and subtilty of designing Priests, to embrace that, where all was kept secret, and where they were in perpetual danger of being imposed upon by the designs and artifices of those whose trade and livelihood depended wholly upon the credulity and ignorance of the people? or would they not rather have said to any that should have endeavoured to perswade them to make so foolish and so unaccountable an exchange of their Religion, as our *Saviour* said to the *Samaritane Woman*, *Tou know not what you worship, we know what we worship, for salvation is of the Jews?* So that besides the direct proof of this assertion, which this consideration will afford, here is also a *Demonstratio per absurdum*, and the manifest inconvenience of the contrary opinion is enough to overthrow it.

Seventhly,

Seventhly, For this reason the law is called the *Covenant of Levi*, Malach. 2. 4. *And ye shall know that I have sent this commandment unto you, that my covenant might be with Levi, saith the Lord of Hosts.* Not but that the *Covenant* was made in common with the whole people of *Israel*, but it is called the *Covenant with Levi*, because as it follows v. 7. *The Priest's lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth, for he is the messenger of the Lord of Hosts.* And then v. 8. to show how easie it was for them, who had the entire possession of the law to themselves, and who were the Oracles upon whom the people depended to impose upon them, and abuse them at their pleasure; it is added, *But ye are departed out of the way, ye have caused many to stumble at the law, ye have corrupted the covenant of Levi.*

Eighthly and lastly, It is to be considered that in all the most ancient times of the *Jewish Church*, the sacred Volume consisted wholly of Consonants, and that the Vowels were supply'd, without the help of any visible Characters, by the skill or *traditionary* usage of the Priests, among whom it was preserved; that it had no Vowels visibly and determinately set down, is evident from the Genius of all the *Eastern* languages, to all of which this defect did anciently belong, and from the Writings of all the *Rabbinical* Doctors, whether Ancient or Modern, who always have, and still do continue to this day, to write down only the Consonants, or unsounding Letters, leaving the Vowels to be supplied by the skill or conjecture of their Readers; and, lastly, from all the ancient MSS. of the *Hebrew Bible* it self; of which *Isaac Vossius*, who had seen Two thousand, an incredible number, affirms, that he never saw any ancients than Six hundred years, which had the *Masorethical* Vowels and Accents annexed to it.

Now.

Now it being clear and evident, to those who understand any thing of these matters, from the nature of the thing it self, and from the experience of those differences which are to be found, by comparing the several Translations, which have been made out of the Original *Hebrew* with one another, by collating the *seventy*, and the *Chalday Paraphrasts*, and the fragments of *Symmachus*, *Aquila* and *Theodotion*, the *Vulgar Latin*, and the ancient *Medrasbes* or *Jewish* Expositions and Paraphrases together, (somewhat of which hath been already attempted by *Capellus*, but yet so as that, without any detraction from that incomparable work, there is still an infinite field remaining for the industry of others to exercise it self) I say, it being evident from all this, that the same Consonants are capable of, and have been actually pointed with different Vowels, which different Vowels shall constitute different words by themselves, and shall by the change of one or more such words make a different sense to arise in a sentence taken together according to the several possibilities of variation in the same clause or sentence; it is manifest that every new way of pointing, is in effect a new Comment or Paraphrase upon the Text, in which this variation is made.

But besides this there is also another sort of variation to be considered, to which the Scriptures of the *Old Testament* are easily, and have been actually exposed either by the mistakes, or by the wilfull and industrious fault of the Transcribers, and that is by the likeness of Consonants either as to their sound or figure either in the *Old Samaritane*, or in the present *Assyrian* Character; such as are the changes of a *Daleth*, a *Resh* and a *Lamed*, by reason of likeness in figure, or of an *Hajin* and an *Aleph*, being both gutturals, for the similitude of sound, into one another; of which sort of alterations there are an incredible number of instances to be found, by comparing



paring the several Translations with one another, to say nothing of that addition which might be made to these by a comparison of all those MSS. which are extant at this day, nor to take notice of the *Keri* and the *Ketib* of the *Masoreth* it self, or of the various readings of *Ben Asher* and *Ben Nephthali*, that is, to say of the *Eastern* and *Western Jews*.

Now whoever shall consider these two causes of different reading or different interpretation, and shall withall suppose the ancient *Jews* to have been every one of them obliged to transcribe an entire Copy of the Law for himself, and to have read it without any Points and Vowels; and, lastly, shall compare this with the mistakes to which men are subject, the wofull ignorance and want of sense, to which the common crowd of all Nations is usually exposed, and much more the *Jews*, who are by nature a stupid, melancholly and superstitious sort of men; and with the conceits and prejudices, the love of novelty, the natural itch of being thought wiser than their teachers, and the wicked ambition which in all ages and nations possesses many mens breasts, of overthrowing and unsettling the present establishment of things, of disobeying their superiours, of gathering Churches or Congregations, as the Modern phrase is, that is, of siding into Factions and Parties, and of disturbing the publique peace and quiet upon religious pretences; and then let him tell me whether it were safe after all this to intrust every private person to transcribe the Law or Prophets, or to point it for himself, that is, in effect to make all the alterations in Religion, which either ignorance, carelessness or design can introduce; nay, whether it would not have been impossible, in so great variety of reading and interpretation as this would have unavoidably occasioned, but that the *Jewish* Nation must have been canton'd and divided into as many Sects, as there were different possibilities



lities of interpretation, arising from either of the two causes, which have been above specified and assigned.

What confusion would this have introduced into the *Ceremonial* part of the *Mosaic* Law, while every alteration of a letter or vowel would have made a new Ceremony, and there would have been as great diversity of rites as there was possibility of variation, and all pretending to the same divine authority to justify and vouch themselves? how would the people, out of that innovating humour which is natural to the populace of all the world, have divided and subdivided themselves into several Parties, Conventicles and Factions? and how would the Priests, as fast as revenge, or ambition, or opiniatry and affectation should prompt them, have put themselves in the head of disagreeing Sects, and would have fomented those differences among the *Jews* with the same real or pretended zeal and earnestness that the *Non-conformists* do now among us, only with this advantage, that the *Jews* might have done it, when the interpretation of places, for want of a standing punctuation, was left so much to every man's honesty and judgment, with infinitely greater plausibility and pretence of warrant from above, than our dissenting Incendiaries can do, who are so shamefully driven out of all their posts, unless it be their ignorance, knavery and impudence, which are citadels impregnable against all the power of argument in the world, and can only be taken in by the faithful and vigorous execution of severe and wholesome Laws? how would they have lampoon'd and ridicul'd the Prophets? and how would the several Parties, by a several way of reading, pointing or accentuation have discharged the several Prophecies at one another? Lastly, what strange uncertainty would this have brought upon the *Law* and *Prophecies*? how would it have confounded all those Prophe-

cies

cies that foretold, and all those Rites and Sacrifices that typified and shadowed out the coming of the *Messias*? And by consequence how would it have perplexed and entangled, nay, plainly evacuated and disannulled all the evidence which we have, besides the unquestionable miracles of our *Saviour* and his *Apostles*, for the *Christian* Religion? how would it have baffled and defeated that argument for our *Saviour's* Person and Doctrine, upon which he himself laid so mighty stress, that he despaired any miracle, how great soever, should persuade them, with whom the testimonies of *Moses* and the *Prophets* were of no force and signification? For upon supposition of such infinite variation, as the Promiscuous use of the Original *Hebrew*, before the use of points, would have introduced, these testimonies could not possibly have been of any weight or value ~~with~~ any considerative or thinking man, because the several readings by their mutual opposition would have destroyed and supplanted one another.

It is so far from being true, that the ancient *Jews* were permitted the promiscuous use and reading of the Law, that it seems rather to have been denied to most of the *Priests* and *Levites* themselves; for we are to consider that in the distribution of the *Levites* to their several employments, there were none admitted to the actual exercise of any sacred office whatsoever, till they were arrived to the age of twenty years, and that at that age they were only capable of the more servile or handiwork employments; and as they arrived to greater maturity of years, so they were admitted to offices and employments of a more honourable nature; that there were some appointed for *Porters*, others for *Singers*, whose business was only to be instructed in the *Songs* of the *Lord*, without any obligation that appears to any particular study of the whole Law: And so for those that

were employed, in dressing or preparing the sacrifices, or in sprinkling the blood, it was not requisite they should learn this skill by a personal converse and acquaintance with the Law; as well because all the Ceremonies belonging to the performance of such Ministeries as these, neither were nor could be prescribed in the Law it self, without swelling it into a much larger Volume, than that in which it is now contained, as hath been already observed, to the shame of all Non-conforming scruples, and to the undeniable justification of humane institutions in religious worship; as because it is seen that things of this nature, that is, the ceremony and formality of Offices, whether Civil or Divine, may be and are actually handed down to men in a *traditionary* way; as it is possible for a man, and many a man actually does understand the Laws of *England* sufficiently well, and yet in the practice of a particular Law-Court, is not half so well skilled as an ordinary Attorney.

Besides all which, it is still further to be considered, that at the return from the Captivity of *Babylon*, as hath been already observed, *Esdra* did not only instruct the people in the knowledge of the Law, but also the *Priests* and the *Levites* themselves, *Nehem.* 8. 13. which would have been needless, if all the *Priests* had been equally instructed in the knowledge of it; or if some of them, unless in those matters which belonged to their particular charges, which as well as the Law it self, were now by seventy years disuse forgotten, had not been either altogether or very nigh as ignorant as the common people.

Wherefore it is most reasonable to conceive, that as the line and family of *Aaron*, were of all the *Levitical* race, the highest in the *Priestly* dignity among the *Jews*, inasmuch that the *Priests* and the *Levites* are frequently distinguished from one another in Scripture (though it is true

true that the *Lewites* were *Priests* too, though in a greater latitude, as well as *Aaron* and his *sons*, being all of them equally substituted instead of the first born, and all of them dedicated, though in a less degree, to the service and ministry of the holy things.) I say, it is highly reasonable from hence to conclude, that the more particular knowledge and study of the Law was confined to the family of *Aaron*, who were those *Priests*, most properly and strictly so called, whose *lips* in the language of *Malachi* were to *preserve knowledge*; and to whose custody alone, as being the most sacred *depositum* in the world, the Original M.S. of the Law it self, or the most Authentique and unquestionable Copy of it, was committed, *Deut.* 17. 18.

It is not certainly for nothing that the Letter or Commission of *Xerxes* to *Esdras* in *Josephus* is thus superscribed, *Εὐδοξὸς ἐστὶ καὶ ἀναγνώστης τῆς θείας νόμου*, to *Esdras* the *Priest*, and *Reader* or *Interpreter* of the Law of God; and so he is called again afterwards in the body of the Epistle it self, which is to me a plain intimation, that the skill of reading, and much more of interpreting the Law, was in the time of *Esdras*, a great rarity among the *Priests* themselves; for that by *ἀναγνώστης* or *Reader*, somewhat more is implied, than what the *Jews* afterwards in their *Synagogue* worship called *Chazan*, and the *Greeks* sometimes *ἀναγνώστης*, is evident from the words of *Epiphanius* in the *Hereſie* of the *Æbionites*, who calls the *Hebrew Chazanim*, by an *Hellenistical* word *Ἀζανῆς*, and interprets it in *Greek* by *διανοῦς* or *ὀμολογῆς*, which is the very word used in *St. Luke's Gospel*; and it is plain from that place of *St. Luke*, and from the interpretation of *Epiphanius*, and the place above cited out of the *Tractate Succa*, that no more was meant by it than an ordinary *Reader* in one of our *Parish-Churches*; whereas *Esdras* was not only a *Priest*, but a *Priest* of greatest note and

dignity among the *Jews* at that time, as appears sufficiently, as well by the sacred Story, as by the testimony of *Josephus*, who calls him, *Antiq. L. XI. c. 5. ἡγεμὸν τοῦ λαοῦ*, the chief Priest of the people, that is, of that part of them, who returned out of *Babylon* into *Judea*, which all the *Jews* did not, the *High Priest* of the whole nation, properly so called, remaining still behind, whose name in the time of *Esdras* was *Joakim*, and was succeeded, after his death, by his son *Eliaſim*, remaining still in *Babylon*, as *Josephus* reports; which is still a new argument to invalidate those testimonies of the ancient Fathers, whereby they would make *Esdras*, to have recovered the law after it was perfectly lost, by a divine inspiration; for certainly it is not very likely that the *High Priest* himself, who was chiefly concerned to understand the law, was any whit less knowing in it than *Esdras*, much less that all the succession, during that Interval, which consisted of three several persons according to *Josephus*, that is, *Jesus*, and *Joakim*, and *Eliaſim*, were all of them so utterly unacquainted with the law, and with their office, as they must be, if this opinion of the Fathers be admitted for truth; besides that what *Josephus* saith of *Esdras*, that he was τῶν Μωσθεως νόμων ἱκανῶς ἑμπειρος, sufficiently or competently skilled in the law of *Moses*, is very short of a divine inspiration.

It being therefore thus clear from so many irrefragable arguments, that the reading of the law till after the translation of the *seventy* was not permitted the commonalty of the *Jews*, (which if it had, it would have been impossible, that both the law and language during this interval, should have been so utterly lost.)

It being certain that they were kept in this ignorance and darkness, even in the time of their best Kings, of *David*, and *Solomon*, and *Josiah*; and that it was so far from

from being disallowed by God himself, that it seems expressly approved by him, in those words of the Prophet *Malachi*, which I have produced.

Lastly, It being no less evident, that such a concealment of the Law, from the knowledge of the common people, could not be without great inconveniences attending it, by exposing them to the cheats and impostures of the *Priests*, as it is at this day in the Church of *Rome* in a great measure, and by being in all probability the occasion of their so frequently relapsing into the idolatrous worship of the Nations round about them.

From hence we have another pregnant instance how strict and religious care was had to the preservation of peace and unity in the *Jewish* Church; and this example pursued into its consequences, is still a stronger argument for all those humane means of unity and publique peace, which if quietly submitted to and obeyed, will bring to pass that blessed end they aim at, without exposing us to any of those dangers and inconveniences with which this *Jewish* prohibition was attended.

If it were lawfull or warrantable, among the ancient *Jews*, to prohibit the reading of the Scriptures, or so much as to permit them not to be read, because the reading of them would be attended with this fatal consequence, that it would infallibly through the perverseness of bad, or the unskillfulness of ignorant men, have been the occasion of great schisms and disorders in the *Jewish* Church and State, (as I have demonstrated, it must needs have proved,) notwithstanding the great danger and inconvenience to which the prohibition it self was exposed; then certainly all those humane institutions which tend to the same end, without the same or any like inconvenience are undoubtedly lawfull and fit to be commanded, and consequently both fit and necessary to be obey'd.



The great design of Religion is the peace and happiness of Mankind, and therefore whatever does in its own nature, or in its direct and necessary consequence, tend to the disquiet and disturbance of the world, is naturally forbidden to men considered as members of a civil society; such was the promiscuous use of the Law and Prophets among the ancient *Jews*, and for that reason it was with equal justice and necessity forbidden; and if it be the same case in the permission of things indifferent, or in the publique allowance of every man's private fancy and humour, as to the circumstances and external Modifications of Divine worship; if this be always found by experience to be a means of crumbling men into Factions and Parties, of alienating mens affections, and disuniting their interests, and setting the several Parties at a perpetual strife and variance with one another; then it follows plainly, that a prohibition of such liberty under legal penalties, which is the only remedy against such disorders, is, because necessary to a necessary end, the peace and welfare of Mankind, lawfull, and a duty incumbent on the Civil Magistrate, to whom the care of the publique peace and safety is committed; which if he shall neglect, he is answerable to God for the greatest breach of trust of which any publique administration is capable; and it being confessedly at every man's own choice, not considering him as a Member of a Society, what indifferent posture or circumstance he will make use of in divine worship, otherwise there could be no indifferent things in nature; it is as necessary when he enters into, or engages himself in a society, that he resign up this liberty to the publique Will of the Supreme Civil Power, as any other privilege or power of acting, with which antecedently to all bargain or compact, he is by nature invested; For this plain reason, because otherwise the society can either not subsist at all, or not without perpetual



tual trouble and disorder; which because it is in all its degrees, a proportionable tendency to an actual dissolution, it may and must be restrained with the same care, with which Rebellion or Anarchy should be avoided; which being the direct contrariety to Government, or the return of Society into a state of nature, is that in whose prevention by all necessary means the Magistrate is chiefly concerned.

We find in Scripture that even divine Laws themselves are sometimes of no force or obligation, when a particular act of Charity or Mercy either to man or beast is concerned; as when *David* and his followers ate the shewbread, which could not legally be eaten by any but the *Priests*; and for the same reason the plucking a Sheep out of a pit, the pulling of ears of Corn, and healing of the blind on the Sabbath-day, are allowed not to be a violation of the Sabbath, though expressly contrary to the words of that Commandment, wherein the observation of the Sabbath, or a feriatio from all manner of work or labour is enjoined; which how strictly it was observed, not only by the superstition of the *Jews*, but by the appointment of God himself, in cases where there was no such absolute necessity, we know by the punishment of him, who was stoned by the whole congregation for gathering of sticks on the Sabbath-day.

If therefore a divine Law may be dispensed with in cases of necessity, at the prudence and discretion of men, what can be more plain than that upon the same account a humane law may justly be enacted? For this reason, because a dispensation of any divine Law, in cases not particularly excepted in the Law it self, is every whit as much an humane institution, as any positive humane Law; and if there be the same reason of necessity in both cases, that is, for the welfare of a particular person, and much more of a whole society, they are both of them of  
equal

equal obligation; neither will it avail any thing in this case to distinguish betwixt humane institutions in sacred and in civil Matters, for certainly the observation of the Sabbath belongs to the former of these; and if humane laws may determine in what particular instances the Sabbath is violated, and in what it is not, that is, in what manner the Sabbath shall be observed; then it may as well determine, nay, and much more, any other bare external circumstance of Worship whatsoever.

But above all things, we can never too frequently reflect upon what hath been said as to the prohibition of reading the Law and Prophets to the *Jews* of old, which being a thing drawing so great inconvenience after it, and which could have no other good meaning than to preserve the peace and unity of the *Jewish* Church, which I have shown plainly, without this prohibition could never have been preserved; this certainly extends in its consequence with much more conclusiveness to all those expedients of publique peace and safety, whatever they be, which have no such inconvenience attending; which to be sure must be the case of all indifferent matters, which would otherwise cease to be indifferent, and by being manifestly hurtfull would lose their name.

But let not any man for all this think or suggest, that in this I favour the cause of the *Papists*, who deny the Populace the use of *Bibles* in the vulgar tongue; for in the first place I only represent matter of fact, without making any application; in the second I say there is great disparity of reason betwixt the *Papists* and the *Jews*; for had the Vowels been added to the Consonants in the *Hebrew* Bibles, so as the sense might have been more plain and less subject either to error or design, which is the case of all our Bibles in the Modern Tongues, there had not then been the same reason to keep them lock't up among the *Priests* that there was; and it would have been as safe to permit

permit every man the use of the Law and *Prophets* for his own private reading, as it was after the *seventy* had compleated their Translation, after which the knowledge of the Law was diffused in common among all the *Jews*.

Again, If the *Law* had contained only matters of Morality and rules of Life, which is the main business of the *Gospel*, it could not have been so lyable to any dangerous corruption, because it would be more difficult for any Doctrine to gain credit among men, which contradicted the common sense and the common interest of Mankind; but in a book of Rituals and Formalities of external worship, as different readings must have produced different rites, so those different rites would have produced so many different Parties and Factions among the *Jews*.

Fourthly, It was absolutely necessary before the appearance of our Saviour in the world, that the Scriptures of the Old Testament should be lay'd open to the knowledge both of *Jew* and *Gentile*, to prepare them for the reception of the *Messias* that was to come, and to render them the more inexcusable, especially the former, if at his appearance they did not give him that welcome and respectfull entertainment, which was due to the greatness of his character and person.

Fifthly, We are expressly commanded in several places of the N. T. to search the Scriptures, we are told that all Scripture is written for our instruction, and *Timothy* is commended by *St. Paul* for his knowledge of the Scripture from his youth upwards; and since all these places in the New Testament, where the Scripture or Scriptures are mentioned are to be understood of the Old, this is sufficient to show how necessary it was sometime before our Saviour's appearance, and at that time it self, and ever since, that the Scriptures of the Old Testament should

be lay'd open and expos'd to the view of *Jew* and *Gentile*, because *Moses* and the *Prophets* did testify of the *Messias*; and it would have been impossible to understand how all the Prophecies and Types of the Old Testament were fulfilled in the person, and by the sacrifice of the *Messias*, without comparing the Life and History of that person, and those types and prophecies together.

Sixthly, Since we are commanded in the Scriptures of the New Testament to study and search into the Scriptures of the Old; and that only for this reason, because they bear their testimony to the *Messias*, whose types and shadows are explained and unfolded in the *Gospel*: this is sufficient to show the obligation we are under, to search the Scriptures of the New Testament also, because they can neither be sufficiently understood without one another; and the reading of the Old is enjoy'd us only for that reason, that we may compare it with the New for our better understanding of both, and especially the latter.

Seventhly, Since the History of our Saviour's Birth and Life, and Miracles and Sufferings are so faithfully and particularly set down in the Gospels, as this was unquestionably intended for the benefit of all succeeding generations, who would otherwise have lost that History, or have received it, corrupted and imbezled by foolish and ridiculous Fables; so the greatest benefit which any man can receive from a Narrative of this nature, is to be expected from the Original Narrative it self, or from such a faithfull translation, as keeps the closest to the literal and Grammatical sense of the Original; besides, that such Translations, made by men of learning and integrity in all ages, into the vulgar tongue, for the use of the common people, are a perpetual security against all the corruptions and impostures of superstitious, ignorant or designing men.

Eighthly,

Eightly, As there is ~~matter~~ of History in the books of the New Testament, which is best preserved and most edifyingly delivered to the common people, as nigh as may be in the very words, which, it may be supposed, the divine Pen-men themselves, had they been to interpret their own books into English, or any other Modern language would have used; so there are also matters of Faith and Practice: The first of which as containing mysteries above humane comprehension, ought to be delivered as exactly as is possible in the very words of the inspired Writers, to doe otherwise, being either to pretend to explain those things which cannot be explained, or to make mysteries of our own, instead of delivering those of God and Religion. And then as to the rules of life and practice, they can never appear in a more Authoritative or becoming garb, thun in that which God himself hath put them; neither can the native simplicity and beauty of the Gospel, that peaceable and gentle temper which it breathes from it self, and is apt to inspire into all that converse with it, be any way so advantageously and so profitably represented to the world, as by every man's perusing the *Gospels* and *Epistles* for himself, by reading the *very Sermons* of our *Saviour* himself, and the advices of his *immediate followers* and *Apostles*, in those very words, or their equivalents in which they were delivered.

Ninthly, Though it cannot be deny'd when we have so many and so sad experiences to convince us of the truth of it, that the reading of the Holy Scriptures in the vulgar tongue is attended with many inconveniences from the perverseness, the design, or the ignorance of men; yet those inconveniences neither are nor can be so great, as that they ought to stand in any degree of competition with the salvation of the souls of men, which are of infinitely more price and value than any other consideration whatsoever.

Tenthly, These inconveniences are not so great as those to which not only particular persons, but Religion it self is exposed by the contrary extreme, that is, by keeping the Bible lockt up in an unknown language, which is in it self, and has been found by experience in the *Romish* Church, to have been the cause of all those monstrous Idolatries and Superstitions, all those absurd Fables and foolish Traditions, with which that communion is at this day polluted; and which instead of being so zealously practised, and so eagerly pursued after by the Votaries of that way, would by the light of Scripture, if they were to take their measures from thence, be sufficiently detected and proportionably abhorred; which is not only manifest from the repugnancy of the Scripture it self, to such abominable trumperies and wicked impositions upon the belief or practice of men, but also from the separation of the reformed Churches from that of *Rome*, which proceeds altogether upon Scriptural measures, and cannot be justified upon any other pretence; and still in all ages, ever since the corruption of Christianity by the *Romish* artifices, from its first simplicity into a fardle of absurdities and innovations, those gainfull impieties have been proportionably detected, as there was more or less of Evangelical light and truth shining forth in the world.

Eleventhly, There never can any so great inconvenience happen by a promiscuous use of the Holy Scriptures in the vulgar tongues, which may not in a great measure, if not altogether, be remedy'd by the strict and impartial severity of wholesome Laws; and where Laws do not govern the outward practices of men, though they have nothing to doe with private opinions, while they remain such and do not walk abroad; there the government must of necessity be dissolved, and all the banks of order and society must give place to a deluge of Enthusiasm and Fanatique madness.

Twelfthly,



Twelfthly, There can no mischief or inconvenience follow upon a publique allowance of reading the scriptures in the vulgar tongues, if there be but such restraints laid upon the practices and opinions of men, as are of absolute necessity to the peace and security of every Commonwealth ; and if thus much may not be allowed, if every man shall be permitted not onely to reade the Scriptures, but to interpret them as he pleases, and to practise in consequence of his interpretation ; so prodigious are the follies, so strong the prejudices, so rash and inconsiderate the zeal, so wicked and detestable the designs of abundance of men ; that if this be the true English of *Gospel-liberty* ; if this be that liberty which *Christ* came to purchase for us, and which he hath entailed upon every follower or disciple of his, then his followers, though agreeing in this, That they all acknowledge him for their head and leader, will yet be at as great strife and variance among themselves ; nay, and perhaps at greater too, than if they had been destitute of such a common guide, who by such an ungovernable, unbounded liberty of interpretation, speaking no certain sense, but accommodating himself in all things, to the follies, prejudices and designs of ignorant or wicked men, will instead of being the *Prince of Peace*, and the healer of all breaches and animosities among us, prove the certain and infallible cause of infinite misery and distraction to the world.

---

F I N I S.





## The Second EXERCITATION,

Concerning the true Pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton, or four lettered Name of God among the Jews; As also concerning the Pythagorick Tetractys and other Philological matters that have a connexion with it.

**A** Ben Ezra in the Introduction to his Paraphrase upon the Book of *Esther* tells us the Samaritanes were used to worship *Afima*, insinuating thereby that they were *Idolaters*, though this indeed be but a *Rabbinical* Equivocation, and is rather a confession in behalf of those whom he would pretend to accuse, that they were Worshippers of the true and onely God that made Heaven and Earth and all that therein is; For what is *Afima*? it is either *Ath shema*, that is, *Hastem*, the name of God among the Jews, or it is *אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְאֵל אֲבוֹתֵינוּ*, him whose name cannot be expressed in its true sound and pronunciation, and so is the same with the *shem hamephorash*; or if it be not an *Equivocation*, it is a downright *Falsehood*, for it was not the men of *Cuth*, as the Jews call the Samaritanes, but those of *Hamath* that worshipped *Afima*, but the *Cuthites* Idol was *Negal*, 2 *Kings* 17. 30. and though all the several Nations there mentioned verse 31. may in some sense be comprehended under the general name of *Samaritanes*, as being all transplanted by *Salmanasser* into that Country, which from *Shomron* the Metropolis was usually called *Samaria*, yet it is manifest that it was but a very small part of them, that worshipped this Idol *Afima*, and therefore *Aken Ezra* cannot free himself from the imputation either of an *Equivocator* or a false *Accuser*.

There is also a certain *Hebrew Gentleman* the Authour  
of

of a Book called *Toledoth Jesu*, or the *Book of the Generations of Jesus*, who is so kind to our *Saviour* as to acknowledge that he was acquainted with the *sod shem hameporash*, the *Arcanum nominis Tetragrammati*, (a mighty secret it seems it was accounted) and if you will believe all that *Snidas* tells you in *Inrus*, you may then make out to your self a probable account how he came by this secret, by being of the number of the *Priests themselves*, among whom this secret seems to have been locked up; but though I grant he knew every thing which was possible to be known, and that from him, as being God, no secret could be hid, yet upon the Authority of such *Jewish Fables* as these, no man will believe any thing that understands what Authority is, and upon what grounds it may safely be relied upon: For as to the first I shall prove that it was not any such secret as is pretended, and for the latter, besides many other absurdities in the Story it self, it is certain that our *Saviour*, any otherwise than by his *Virgin Mother's* side, which could not entitle him to the *Priesthood*, was not of the Tribe of *Levi*; but of that of *Judah*, of which *Joseph* his reputed Father was descended, and in whose right by a tacit kind of *ἰσθμία* or Adoption he was the Son of *David* and the King of the *Jews*.

How long the *Jews* have been ignorant of the true pronunciation of this sacred Name may be seen in part by *Phile Judæus*, who seems to have been ignorant of it himself, and to pronounce the same of the generality of his Countrymen the *Jews*, L. 3. *de vita Moſis*, where he hath these words, speaking of the *Breast-plate* which was to be upon the *Ephod* of the *High Priest*, *Exod. 28.* and particularly of the *binding of woven work* mentioned v. 32.

χρυσὸν ὃ πῖπλον, ὡσανὶ εἶραν· ἰδμμεγῆτο, πῖπλον  
 ἔχον γλυφὰς ὀνόματα, ὁ μόνος τοῖς ὤτοι καὶ γλυφῆται σο-  
 φία καὶ καθαγεμῆτοις θύμις ἀκίω καὶ λίγω· αἱ ἀγίαι, ἀλλὰ  
 δ' ὕδρι τὸ πῖπλον ὕδαμ· πλεγεγῆμμετω ὃ τῶμα  
 ρῆτον

ἐπὶ τῷ ὤστρεῳ ἡ); that is, about the Breast-plate there went as it were a golden Bracelet, interwoven with the four Letters of that name, which it is not lawfull for any either to speak or hear, unless it be in the Sanctuary, having first rightly prepar'd and purify'd themselves. Now if it can be proved that Philo had never read the Law in Hebrew, then it is plain that he himself was ignorant of those letters of which this name consisted, and this besides other instances which may be given of his great unskillfulness in the Hebrew Customs and Language, cannot be better made out, than by the place it self which I have justly newly produced, in the close of which he says, *τετραγράμματος τὸ ὄνομα ἐπὶ τῷ ὤστρεῳ ἡ*, the Theologue or Divine, that is, Moses, (who by Lucian in his *Philopatris* is called ὁ βραχυλόγος, the slow Speaker) tells us that this name consisted of four letters, which Moses does no where say; though indeed as it was delivered down to Posterity by him, it consisted of no more.

Neither was Josephus any more knowing in this Affair, after all his brags of an extraordinary skill above other men, than Philo; his words are these, L. 5. ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐστὶν ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ ἱερέως περιβεβλημένη τινὶ στέφανῳ, καὶ περιβεβλημένη ὑπὸ τοῦ χρυσοῦ ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ σίαντος ἐκτίκταται φάρος τῶν ἱερῶν τετραγράμματος, ταῦτα δὲ ἑστὶν ὅσα τέσσαρες; that is, his head was covered with a Linnen Tiara or Mitre, which was to be surrounded with a blew or purple Lace, about which there was to be another binding of gold having the four sacred Letters woven in it, now those four Letters are four Vowels.

Now if these four Letters were not Vowels but Consonants then it is manifest that Josephus was mistaken, and consequently was unacquainted with the Tetragrammaton in its original form and appearance.

I am not ignorant that *Joseph Scaliger* in his Notes upon a fragment of *Porphyrie* in *Eusebius* will needs have it that *φωνητα* in *Josephus* does not signify *Vowels* properly so called, but any Letters whatsoever, but by the favour of so great a man the contrary is unanswerably manifest from the place it self, for if by *γεννηματα* immediately foregoing Letters in general are to be understood, as there is no doubt or question to be made but they are, then it is manifest that when he adds, *ταυτα εστι φωνητα ρημεα*, these Letters are the four *φωνητα*, he must be supposed to restrain the genus of *γεννηματα* or Letters to the species of *φωνητα* or Vowels; and to say otherwise is but to repeat the same thing several times over to no purpose, it being as much as if *Josephus* had said, that the Mitre of Aaron had a Band about it interwoven with four Letters, which four Letters were four Letters, so blind are great men sometimes out of a too indulgent fondness for their own Conceits, when they are hunting about, through all the cold scents of Criticism to support a very lame and feeble Conjecture, which was *Scaliger's* business in this place. It is plain therefore that by *φωνητα* in *Josephus*, Vowels are to be understood, and that he must be understood of the name *ΙΕΥΩ*, as that holy Name was represented by *Philo Byblius* out of *Sanchoniaton*, for there is no other that I can find or hear of consisting of four Vowels.

To this place of *Josephus* I shall adde another from his *Antiquities*, L. 2. p. 61. by which, though it will still appear more plain, how ignorant he was as to this commonly reputed *Mystery*, so by the help of what he tells us, we shall afterwards find a way by which this *Mystery* shall be plainly and demonstratively revealed. His words are these, speaking of the Miracles that were wrought to perswade *Moses*, that it was indeed no other than *God himself*, that was about to send him upon so dangerous

dangerous and so displeasing an Errant to *Pharaoh King of Egypt*. Μαυρίς δ' ἐκ τῶν ἀπείρων οἷς ἐπηγγέλλετο τὸ Δίον, διατὴς τε τοῦτων βεβαιωμάτων, καὶ ἀερεατὴς γυνάμεθα, ἐξέμεθα αὐτῇ; καὶ προσβῆναι ταύτης τὴ δυνάμεις ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ διδούς, ἐπιβλέπει μὲν δόματι αὐτῇ γυνὴν τῇ βίᾳ ρυθῆσαι, οὐκ ἔστι αὐτῇ μετεσχέσει καὶ ὅλας ἐπὶ καὶ τὴν προσηγορίαν εἶπεν, ἵνα Δίον ἐκ δόματι αὐτὸν παρῆναι τοῖς ἱεροῖς προσκαλῇ, καὶ ὁ Διὸς αὐτῇ σμῆναι τὴν αὐτὴν προσηγορίαν, ἡ περὶ τὴν εἰς ἀθανάτους παρελθούσαν, πρὸς ἧς ἡ μοῖ Δίμω εἶπεν; that is, *Moses being no longer able to withstand so great Testimonies of a Divinity, having seen and heard so great attestations of a Divine Power; besought him further, that he would continue to give the same Proofs and Evidences of himself in Egypt, and that he would vouchsafe to acquaint him with his name, that so when he came to doe sacrifice to him, he might entreat him to be present to and to accept of his Sacrifice by that name which was most pleasing to him, with which request of his it seemed good to the Divine Majesty to comply, and to acquaint him with that name of his, which was till that time unknown to mortal Men, and which it is not lawfull for me to utter.*

If it be demanded how this *name of God*, which is the most proper to him and the most expressive of his nature, as shall be hereafter declared; came to be so great a secret, even to the *Jews* themselves, who ought in reason to be the most familiarly acquainted with it, as being derived from a Root of their own Language, there are two accounts to be given of it.

First that general Reverence which has prevailed in all Nations for the *name of God*, which by being used upon every ordinary occasion, would render his Being less respected, and his Power less feared than it ought to be amongst Men, of which we have a very remarkable Instance in an Epigram of an uncertain Authour in the Anthology.

Ὁυ μὰ ἤ, ἐδὴ Λύκανα παρίσταν ὅττι ποδαλγὸς  
 ——— Κατθαν.

Where the Epigrammatist speaks in a form of solemn swearing, but does not name that God to whom he makes his appeal. And so also *Pindar*, as he is cited by *Brodeus* in his Notes upon this *Epigram*, καὶ μὰ ἤ ἔρκεν; where the *Scholiast* says, ἐλαβεῖται ἤ ὁμῶς ἐν Ἀρχαῖσι περιλήπτων τὰ ὀνόματα τῶν Θεῶν; out of reverence to so sacred a thing as an Oath and to the Gods to whom the appeal is made, the Ancients were wont to leave out the names of their Gods, even then when they swear by them. So also *Aristophanes* in his *Βάτραχοι* —

Μὰ ἤ, ἐγὼ μὲν ἐδ' αὖ ἐῖ τις ἴδωται μοι.

where the *Scholiast* thus glosses upon the place; ἰδὼν, πῶς ὁμῶς καὶ ὕτως ἐδ' ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις, ὥστε μὴ προσθίνειν ἤ θεὸν ἐλαβεῖται χάριν; that is, he swears elliptically or imperfectly, for this is the custome of the Ancients when they swear, sometimes out of reverence to leave out the name of that God whom they invoke.

A second cause of this ignorance among the Jews was that this reverence to the name of God, having in a manner worn it out of use among the Jews themselves, the *Seventy* when they came to translate the *Law*, and *Prophets* (if indeed they did translate both at the same time, which is much questioned by learned Men) would not expose that *holy name* to the view and knowledge of the *Gentile world*, which had been either very high or altogether concealed from the Jews themselves; and therefore in their Translation they always render it by *Κύριος*, a name in *Greek* equally significative of *Existence* and *Authority*



thority together, the *first* of which, as being the basis of all other Attributes, is the foundation of the *latter*. So that the reading of the Scriptures not being permitted the common *Jews* (as I have in part proved already, and shall prove more largely and more clearly by and by) till such time as the Version of the *Seventy* prevailed in the world, and was exposed equally to the sight and perusal both of *Jew* and *Gentile*; it is no wonder that this Ignorance in so important a matter instead of being improved by that *Translation*, should rather be confirmed and take deeper root from thence, so as utterly to banish the Knowledge of it, as well out of the *Jewish* as the *Gentile* world; so as had it not been for the *Monuments* of *Sanchoniathon*, and some other remains of *Antiquity*, known onely to the more curious and inquisitive sort of men, it had been utterly lost and forgotten, and its true pronounciation could have been onely ghes'd at, without any certainty of truth, as it is at this day, not without a palpable discovery of their ignorance in the matter, by the *Masorethical Pointers* of our present *Hebrew Bibles*; wherefore *Josephus* and *Philo* not being acquainted with those monuments of *Antiquity* which I have mentioned, nor with the *Original Hebrew* it self, (which I believe to be true of *Philo* especially, and very probably of the other also) at least being ignorant of the true punctation of that word, which since their being carry'd away captive into *Babylon* was now utterly lost among the *Jews themselves*, it is no wonder they speak of it, as of a name which it was not lawfull to utter, being willing to excuse their unskillfulness by a *pretended reverence* for that name whose true pronounciation and sound they did not know.

But, as I have said, though *Josephus* himself were a stranger to the *Tetragrammaton* or name of God consisting of *four Letters*, yet by that light which we may borrow

from him, we may be able to demonstrate what this Name was, of what Consonants it consisted, and with what Vowels it ought to be pointed.

For in the first place, when *Moses* desired to know by what name he should invoke Almighty God when he was sacrificing to him, or rather as the *Scripture* it self declares it, what name he should make use of to *Pharaoh*, as the name of that *divine Person* by whom he was employ'd, he adds, καὶ ὁ θεὸς διηγήσατο τὸν ὄνομα ἑαυτοῦ, ὃ προέβηεν ἐκ ἀνδράπων, παραδόντων, ὑπὲρ ἧς ὁ μὲν ἱσχυίς ἐπαύειν, God then acquainted him with that name of his, which till that time was unknown to men, and which it was not lawfull for *Josephus* to utter. Now this name of God consisting of four Letters, (for it is the *Ehjeh* asher *Ehjeh*, I am that I am, which the *Seventy* translate ὁ αὖν, and *Philo Judæus* in more places than one ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ αὖν, I am he that is) it is manifest that this is the proper *Tetragrammaton* or sacred Name of God, to which the *Jews* have always paid so great and so just a veneration.

And if we consider further that in the Monuments of the *Greek Antiquity* there is extant, as the name of the Supreme Numen among the *Jews*, ἰάω, as appears by the voice of *Clarius Apollo* in *Macrobius*, and by many other Testimonies produced by *Bochartus*, and by two other Inscriptions, the one not known, the other not taken notice of by him.

A B P A E A Σ I A Ω, and  
A B P A Σ A E I A Ω

The first of which is taken notice of by *Scaliger* in his Notes upon that Fragment of *Porphyrie* which I have mentioned; and the last is the Inscription of an *Antique Seal* now in the possession of my Reverend and Learned Friend

Friend Dr. *Covell*, a present great Ornament of that excellent Society, of which I have the honour and happiness to be a Member.

*Lastly*, if by a very little variation of the present punctuation, instead of *Ehje* by a *segol*, we shall read it *Ehjob* by an *holem*, then by taking away the *he* which being an aspirate in the middle of a word cannot be expressed in *Greek*; that which is left is *idw*, or for better sound's sake *idw*, as what the *Hebrew* calls *Ramathaim*, the *Seventy* for the greater sweetness of the sound have called *αμαδαιμ*; and this is the reason why in *Greek* it consists but of three Letters, whereas in the *Hebrew* it hath four, because the Aspirate which cannot be expressed by the *Greeks* any where but in the beginning of a word is lost, which is likewise acknowledged by *Bochartus* in his *De Colonia Phœnicum*, L. 1. c. 9. though in the true *Etymon* of the word *idw* he be as widely mistaken; his words are these, *Insula Chia est insula Serpentis, ex Chinja, V consonum à Græcis est necessario omissum, ut in idw ex Javoh Dei nomine Tetragrammato*; that is, *The Island Chia (or Chios) is as much as to say the Island of a Serpent, from the Syriac Chinja leaving out the V consonant which by reason of its aspiration the Greeks cannot express, as in idw from the Hebrew Javoh which is the Tetragrammaton or four lettered name of God.* But by his Favour there is no such word as *Javoh* in the world, no nor *Javoh* neither, which was Saint *Jerome's* conceit, though the latter Editions have read it corruptly *Jehovah* in his Commentary upon *Psal. 8. Prins nomen Domini apud Hebræos quatuor literarum est, jod, he, van, he, quod proprie Dei vocabulum sonat & legi potest Javoh*, by which he would imply that the *Greek idw* answers to this *Javoh* in *Hebrew*, though still we gain thus much by this Testimony of Saint *Jerome*, that the holy Name of God, usually called the *Tetragrammaton* was written exactly with the same letters in his daies,

with

with those which are now extant in our Modern Bibles; and the same thing appears likewise in the ΠΙΠΙ of *Procopius* in *Esajab*, which I make no question was taken out of the *Tetrapla*, or *Hexapla*, or *Ottapla* of *Origen* in all which Editions, one Columne was the *Hebrew* written in *Greek* Characters and with *Greek* Vowels; but the Name of God, consisting of these four Letters which I have mentioned, was, as I conceive, (its true pronounciation being at that time unknown to the *Jews* themselves, or if it were known it was so superstitiously sacred that it was thought unlawfull to utter it) expressed onely by its Consonants without the addition of any Vowels, which being read backwards according to the *Eastern* Fashion, is exactly the *Procopian* ΠΙΠΙ. And if this explication of *isa* which I have given be the true, it will then answer exactly to that explication of it which is given by *Clemens Alexandrinus* from Lib. 5. *ισα δ̄ με-  
σεμμελεται δ̄ αν και δ̄ ιουαν*®, for both of these *ehjob* which is the Future Tense from *hajah* will signify, as well because the Future Tense in *Hebrew* is both of a future and present signification, sometimes one and sometimes the other, as because he that affirms of himself, *ehjob*, that is, *εγω ιουαν*, or, *εγω ειμι δ̄ ιουαν*®, *I will be*, or, *I am he that will be hereafter*, does by that very affirmation include and suppose his present existence.

*Bochartus* his *Etymon* of this name, is therefore certainly false, as well because he is forced to recurr to a needless Elision of the V consonant, as because the ancient Future Tense from *Havah* was not *Javoh* but *Jehvoh* as I shall prove immediately; and Saint *Jerome's* Solution is therefore absurd, and consequently false, upon supposition that *Jahob* is from the Present Tense *Havah*, because it melts a radical into a quiescent letter, which certainly ought not to be.

Again,

Again, as *Josephus* in the place last mentioned is to be understood of *lāw* or *Ehjob*, as hath been shewn, so when he tells us that the *תשׁוּבָה* the letters of which the holy Name of God consisted, were *תשׁוּבָה* *four vowels*, it is equally manifest that he can be understood of no other name, than the *ΙΕΤΩ* of *Sanchoniathon*, which he learned of *Jerombadl*, that is, *Gideon*, as *Bochartus* rightly determines; for there is no other name of God in *Hebrew*, which being expressed in *Greek Characters*, will consist of *four vowels* but this; and as *lāw* answers to the *Hebrew ehjob* which is the first Person of the Future Tense from *hajah*; so *lāw* is the *Hebrew jehvoh*, that is the third Person singular of the same Future Tense from *havah*, which is the same with *hajah*, as our first Mother *Eve* was therefore called *chauah*, with a *vau*, because she was *eem col chai*, the mother of all living, with a *jod*, and so both of these names as well *lāw* as *lāw*, will signify the same, and will be both of them expressive of the *Divine Existence* which is the foundation of his power; all the difference is that when God speaks of himself his name is *ehjob*, but when men speak of God his name is *jehvoh*, and both of them are fitly enough rendred by the *Seventy* *ὁ ὢν*, *he that is*, or *ὁ κύριος*, which is the same, for one signification of *κύριος* is *κύριος*, and by the Oracle *αὐτογενής*, *he whose original is from himself*.

Μῆνοι γὰρ δὲ τοῖς σοφῶν λόγον ἢ ἀπὸ τῶν αἰσθη-  
 τῶν ἀποκρίσας ἀνακρίσας σιβαζόμενοι διδοὺς ἀγνῶς.

And that the change of the punctuation from a *segol* to a *cholem* may be no longer a scruple, I will now shew that this was indeed the ancient way of punctuation, from a place of *Plantus* in his *Panulus*, where *Milphio*

thus salutes *Hanno* the *Carthaginian* and his companions in his own Language.

*Avo* Quo*j*ates estis? aut quo ex oppido?

And again,

*Ha. Avo* Mil. salut*at*. And a little after, *Mi. Avo Donni*, which being so often repeated, it cannot be questioned, but it is the true reading, and that *Avo*, is as much as the Latin *Ave*, *salve*, that is, it is the Imperative from *Havab*, which signifies to be or to live; and if *Hevob* be the Imperative, then *Jehvob* is the Future, as well in *Hebrew* as *Punique*, for these two are in a manner the very same, as will appear by those large Remains of the *Punique* Language extant in *Plautus*, which have been learnedly explained by comparing them with the pure *Hebrew*, by our Countryman *Mr. Selden* in his ingenious and learned Treatise *de Diis Syris*, by *Samuel Petitus* in his *Miscellanea*, and lastly by *Bochartus* himself in the second part of his *Geographia sacra* which is *de Colonia Phanicum*; besides that the names both of *Persons* and *Places* in the *Phanician* Tongue are a sufficient argument of its near affinity or rather perfect sameness with the pure *Hebrew*, so that I think for the proof of my Assertion, here is all the authority that can with reason be expected, but yet to put it beyond all doubt or question I shall add two or three Considerations more.

And first, whereas *Theodore*t upon *Exodus* represents the *Samaritan*e pronunciation of this holy Name very different from the *Hebrew*, *καλῶν δ' αὐτὸ, saith he, Σαμαριτῶν μὲν ἱαβὶ, ἰουδαίων δ' ἰάω*. From this it is to be observed.

First, That when *Theodore*t affirms the *ἰάω* to have been peculiar to the *Jews* in distinction from the *Samaritanes*, this includes an affirmation that the *Jewish* punctuation was properly by an *Holem*.



In the second place, as a farther confirmation of that Pointing and Pronunciation of this *sacred Name* which I have assigned, I appeal to the custome of the Ancients in their adoration of a *Sneeze*; for as it is still our custome upon that occasion to say *God bless* or *God save you, Sir*, with a bow towards the person to whom the Salutation was made, so anciently they were used at all such times, to say, *Ζεῦ σῶσον*, which is the same; the reason of which was, that the person so affected, does by the very *Sneeze* it self pronounce the *holy name* of God, which is *Ehjob*, which being thus casually and involuntarily pronounced, the standers by were used to invoke him in behalf of the party *Sneezing*, saying, *Hoshiah*, or some such word signifying a Prayer for his health and safety. And from hence it was that *Xenophon* cited by *Aristotle* out of the third of his *ἀνάξαις*, calls the *Sternutamentum* or the *Sneeze* it self a *God*, and the Bird of *Ζεὺς σωτὴρ*, or *Jupiter, the Saviour*, but not for that reason which he, not understanding the true original of this Custome, assigns, διὰ τὴν ἐκ τῆς θεωρίας πρὸς ἡμᾶς καὶ κεφαλῆς, ὅθεν ὁ λογισμὸς ἔστι, γινῆσθαι, because it proceeds out of that most Divine and Godlike part of the head, which is the seat of Reason, or of Ratiocination. For I make no manner of question but the true reason was that which I have assigned, and the rather because he calls it not onely a *God*, but the *bird of Jupiter Servator*, which puts me in mind of a passage in *Plato*, where *Socrates* exhorts to sacrifice a Cock to *Æsculapius*, for this *Æsculapius* is *Jupiter Servator*, and the sound of a Cock crowing, is much the same with that of a *Sneeze* in men, *Ehjob*.

For this reason it was that they used to consult a *Sneeze* as a certain Oracle to resolve them in doubtfull Cases, or in future Events: So the Husband in the *E-*



*pigram* that had a mind to be rid of a troublesome Wife,  
Sneez'd over her Grave in a publick Burying place, to  
know when she would die.

L. 1. Ἐς γυναικα.

Ἐπ' αὐτὴν ἄλλ' ἅπασιν καὶ ἡδύλον αὐτὸς ἀκούσαι,  
Ὅσας αἰσιμῶς μοῖραν ἔμης ἀλόχου.

Ἐπ' αὐτὴν εἰς ἀνέμους· ἀλόχου δ' μοι ἔπ' κρυφάνα  
Λυγρὸν οὐ αἰθρῶντος, ἢ νόσῳ, ἢ θανάτῳ.

Propertius,

*Aridus Argutum sternuit Omen Amor.*

Catullus,

*Acmen Septimius suos amores  
Tenens in Gremio, mea, inquit, Acme,  
Ni te perditè amo atque amare porro  
Omnes sum assidue paratus annos,  
Quantum qui pote plurimum perire,  
Solut in Lybiâ Indiâque tostâ  
Cæso veniam obviis Leoni.  
Hoc ut dixit, Amor, sinistra, ut ante,  
Dextram sternuit approbationem.*

Which place of *Catullus* I have cited thus largely, because  
the latter part of it which cannot be understood without  
what goes before, is so excellently Translated by Mr. Cow-  
ley, with allusion to the ancient custome of *bowing* and  
*adoring* a Sneeze.

*The God of Love, that stood to hear him,  
(The God of Love was always near him)  
Pleas'd and tickl'd with the sound,  
Sneez'd aloud, and all around.*

*The little Loves that waited by,  
Bowd and blest the Augury.*

A third reason by which my Conjecture concerning the *Tetragrammaton* may be confirmed, is that in *Antiquity* we find mention also of a seven-lettered name of God. So the *Oracle*

Καὶ σπένδε καὶ καὶ ἕξασον ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑπτάκλιτου.

And in the *Epigram*,

Ἐπὶ δὲ με φωνήσῃς δὲν μὴ γὰρ ἀφ' ὧν ἀπὸ  
Τετράμματος ἢ πέντε ἀνθράκων παρὰ.

which places when *Scaliger* endeavours to explain by HOA IETΩ, he trifles most egregiously, for how is that HOA by which he designs to express the *Hebrew* נְוִי, a part of the name of God? neither does he mend the matter when he is, as he is afterwards, in a quandary with himself, whether he should explain it of the *Egyptian Serapis*, or of the *Basiliidian Abraxas*, both of which have seven letters, but by his favour, neither of them seven vowels; which is the thing requisite to explain these two Citations, especially the latter, for he does not only say that they are ἑπτά φωνήσῃς, but also φωνήσῃς τετράμματος, which for the reasons already given in our Discourse of ἡύω, can be understood of nothing but vowels, which can be explained no better, than by putting both the names of God already mentioned together, which the ignorance of the *Greeks* might well enough jumble into one thus, IETΩΙΑΩ.

Neither is it at all material in this case, that some of these Vowels are twice repeated, for there are not seven vowels in all; and the *Rabbins* by the same

K k

way

way of speaking, call the *Tetragrammaton* *shem shel Arabah Othijoth*, the name of God consisting of four letters, though the *He* be twice repeated. And from hence we may see the error of *Bochartus* in these words. *Geogr. Sac. p. 856. Eusebius habet iuxta sed Theodoretus iuxta, quod ideo praefero, quia Dei nomen duobusmodi, Graeci vix aliter efferunt*, for I think by this time it is sufficiently clear, that as well *iuxta* as *iuxta*, was the real and undoubted name of God answering to the Hebrew *Jehvoh*.

Lastly, God is not only called in Scripture *Ehjob*, and *Jehvoh*, but more contractedly *Jah*, which is described in Scripture as his peculiar and incommunicable name; so in the *Psalms*, at the close of a *Psalms* or *Verse*, *Hallelu Jah*, which the *LXX.* render *Αλληλuia*; and *Psa. 68. 4. Sing unto God, sing praises to his Name: extoll him that rideth upon the Heavens by his name JAH, and rejoyce before him. Hebr. bejab shmo. Symmachus δα τς ια ερωμαχα αινω. the ancient version which was called quinta Editio. & τς ια. LXX. Κεα. ερωμα αινω*; from all which we have a clear account both of its true pronunciation and its true meaning. Its true, or at least its most common pronunciation was *Jah*, and its meaning is *Κεα*, that is, *ο ων* the same with *Ehjob*, and *Jehvoh*; it is therefore the *Imperative Mood* from *Hajah*, as from *Halac* or *jalac*, is *Lek*, from *Nagash*, *Gash*, and the like; and as the other names are as much as to say *he is*, or *he shall continue to be*, so this is as much as to say *let him be*, or *let him live*; it is *vox per gratulationem agnoscens & adorantis existentiam Dei*. So *Rom. 3. 4. Let God be true and every man a liar*, is as much as if the *Apostle* had said in two *Categorical Enunciations*, *God is true and every man is a liar*. And *Psal. 69. 34. Let the Heaven and Earth praise him, the Seas and every thing that moveth therein*; that is, they do actually praise him, by being through all ages constant and perpetual testimonies of his goodness and power. It

It will be objected, that if the second *Future* be *Ehjob*, the *imperative* or first *Future* ought to be *Hejob*, or *job*, not *Jab*, and this is true; but why may it not be both of these, both in the *imperative* and *future*, though the punctuation by a *Pathach* be more common in the *imperative*, and that by a *Cholem* in the *future*? for after all what if that *laße* of the *Samaritanes*, or as *Scaliger* represents it, *laßu*, be not so much a mistake, or a wilfull error, as one of the ancient ways of Pointing this *holy Name*; that is, *Jabvab*, or *Jebvab*? of which opinion *Scaliger* seems to have been; and if that reading which *Mr. Selden* represents as the common reading, be the true, which is not the *Asæ* of *Bochartus*, but *lā*; then this place of *Theodoret* does not so much represent the difference of the *Samaritane* from the *Hebrew*, as of the *Hebrew* from it self, being the two Names of God, the one the *Tetragrammaton* *Jebvab* or *Jebvab*, the other, as I may so call it, the *Digrammaton*, which is *Jab*; though *Hasebelius* not having considered those places of the *Seventy*, and *Symmachus*, and the *Fifth Edition* which I have mentioned, would needs have it *laa*, and in this he is followed by *Mr. Selden* and *Bochartus*, though I see no reason to believe otherwise, than that they may be all mistaken.

From *Jab* is the *Greek* *Zās*, the *Jod* being changed into the *Greek* *Zēta*, as these two letters are easily changed into one another; as from *Zurðs* is *Juzum*, from *Zāl@* the *French* *Jaloux*, and the *English* *Jealous*.

*Pherecydes Syrius,*

*Zās* πωτὶ φάρ@ μέγα καὶ καλόν.  
 Καὶ ὡς ἀντὶ πικρῶν ὄρων,  
 Καὶ τὴ τῷ ὄντι δόμοισι.

From the same Original likewise, is the *lāz* in *Alexander*.

under *Trallianus* in his *Magical Charm* for the Cure of the Gout; as *ἰαω* in the same Authour, is exactly the Greek *ἰαω*, or the Hebrew *Ehjah*, the *He finale* not being quiescent as in *ἰαω*, but changed into *Th*, as *Pharaoh* in the Hebrew, is in the LXX. *Pharaoh*, and in *Josephus Pharaohes* and *Phraates*, for these are both of them the same name.

I was once of Opinion also, that the *Abraxas* of the *Basilidians* so often mentioned, was as much as *Ἀβραξάμ* in composition with *ζᾶς*, as much as to say *Ὁὗς Ἀβραξάμ*, as God is often called in Scripture; but since I see Reason to change my mind, not only from the ancient Inscriptions and ancient Copies, which do more frequently represent *Ἀβραξᾶς* than *Ἀβραξάμ*; but chiefly because *Tertullian de Præscriptionibus*, represents *Abraxas* as the supreme Numen of *Basilides* and *Valentinus*, who yet notwithstanding, looked upon the God whom the Jews worshipped, under the notion and character of an inferior Deity, being only the *Tutelar Angel* of the particular Province of *Judea*: therefore I concur with that account which *Tertullian* and other of the Fathers give of it, that it was only an Adumbration of the Sun or the Solar year, which consists of 365 days, which number is made up by the numeral Potestas of those letters of which *Abraxas* consisteth. I had likewise once such another conceit of the *Abracadabra*, which is a Charm for the Cure of the *Hemitritean* or Double *Tertian* Ague in *Serenus Sammonicus*, because *Chad* or *Echad*, which signifies unity in Hebrew, is reckoned by *Macrobius* as one of the names of God; but this I confess is a little hard, and therefore I am rather of opinion, that it was a *Magical* word made at random, all whose power consists in this, that the beginning and end of it are the same, to signify the returns of the *Fit*, but the middle of a very different and disagreeing sound to denote the day of intermission.

From

From *Zās* by a very light mutation is the *Greek Zāv*, which is the name of *Jupiter* upon the *Theban* Monument in *Porphyrie*,

Ὀὐδὲ θανὼν καὶ Ζāv ὅν Δία καλεῖσθον.

From *Zāv* is the *oblique case* *Zwēs* or *Zavēs* in the *common Greek*, and from thence is the *Latin Janus*, the *Eolique Zava* and the *Latin Juno*; as *Salmasius* upon *Lampridius*, and *Ægidius Menagius* upon *Diogenes Laertius* have observed, though the last of these may perhaps be rather from the *Syriack Junob*, or *Jonob*, which signifies a *Dove*, in which form *Semiramis* was worshipped among the *Assyrians*; *Tzetzes* for better sound sake, leaves out the *jod*, and calls it *ἰνῶ*,

Κατὰ ἰσοβόλον γλῶσσῳ καὶ τῷ ῥῆϊ Σύρων ἄμα  
 Χερσὶ δουρὶ τῷ ἄμπλον, ἑνὶ περιστράν δι,  
 Τῷ ῥῶ παρὶ δι ἑλλῶνες περιστράν ὀνάδα—

Lastly, From the *Hebrew Jab*, by turning the *He* into an *Aspirate*, was the *Greek Iάχ*, and the *Latin Jacchus*.

Again, as from *Jab* is *ζās* and *Zan* and *Zano* and *Janus*, and the rest that have been mentioned, so also in the *Heathen Mythology*, there want not manifest footsteps of the other punctuation by a *Cholem*; for as from *Jab* is *ζās*, so from *Joh* is *ζῶs* or *ζῶs*, for so they pronounced it, as is evident from the *Latin Jouis* derived from it, which was not pronounced anciently, as I conceive, by an *v* consonant or *Eolique Digamma*, but by an *u* vowel; and so *Jupiter*, is as much as *Jouipiter*, which I look upon to be a clearer *Etymology* than either *Juvans Pater*, which was the conceit of *Cicero*, *Agellius* and *Lactantius* among the *Ancients*, or *Jouis Pater* of the *Moderns*,

which with the *Eolique Digamma* is much more harsh, because it depends upon an unnecessary contraction of the word, than if by *dissolving* that *vconsonant* into a *vowel* it be all melted down into one Syllable, which by the addition of *Pater*, is of it self without any further former ation, the very word enquired after; unless you would have it to be *Ζηνάρας*, which turns to the same account, and therefore I shall not be against it, though in the latter the *Analogy* be more exact, as in *Marspiter*, *Diespiter*, and such other words; besides that, it answers indifferently both to *Jopiter* and *Jupiter*, which were the two several ways of writing it among the *Romans*, who were always used to add the title of *Pater* or *Genitor* to the names of all their Gods.

Lucilius,

*Ut nemo sit nostrum, quin Pater optimus Divum,  
Ut Neptun' Pater, Liber, Saturnus Pater, Mars,  
Janus, Quirinus Pater, nomen dicatur ad unum.*

Where Mr. Selden after *Doufa*, instead of *Nomen dicatur*, will needs have it *omnes dicamur*, not considering that the quantity of the Verse will not bear it, nor understanding what is the true meaning of *Nomen* in this place, which is not what we call a *proper name*, and the *Latines* otherwise *vocabulum*; but it is *Numen*, which was the old way of writing, and of which by going no further than the *Glossary* of *Philoxenus*, you may soon be furnished with Five hundred Instances.

Thus *Ennius* in *Lactantius* introduces the people of *Rome* praying to *Romulus* after he had been snatched from them, in these words.

————— *O Romule, Romule, dic, O  
Qualem te Patriæ custodem Dii genuerunt ?*



*Tu produxisti nos intra hominis auras,  
O Pater, O Genitor, O Sanguen Diis oriundum.*

And in the same Language *Æneas* bespeaks his *Followers* and *Companions* concerning *Anchises* in *Virgil*.

*Nunc Pateras libate Jovi, precibusque vocate  
Anchisen Genitorem*—————

Where by *Genitor* is not understood the *Father* of *Æneas*, though that he was too, but him that was now translated into the order and dignity of the Gods.

So, also among the *Greeks* *Ἀνδρας* is as much as *Abheljon*, *Pater excelsus*; the *high* or *lofty Father*, which is a very fit name for the *Sun*; and this puts me in mind of that place of *Horace*,

—————*Credat Judæus Apella  
Non Ego*—————

Where there are some that will needs have *Apella* to be as much as *Sine Pelle*, or *Verpus*, which the quantity of the Verse will not suffer. Wherefore the true reading is *Ἀνδρας*, *Apellas*, that is, *Apollonius*, or *Apollodorus*, or *Apollimarius*; as *Theudas* is *Theodosius*, *Hermas* is *Hermotimus* or *Hermodorus*, *Epaphras* is *Epaphroditus*, *Antipas* is *Antipater*, *Cleophas* is *Cleophilus*, *Joses* is *Josephus*, and many other of the like nature.

And *Baal Peor* because he is supposed by *St. Jerom* in more places than one, and by *Isidore* in his *Origenes*, to be the same with *Priapus* of the *Greeks* and *Latines*, is therefore thought by *Dionysius Vossius* in his Notes upon *Maimonides de Idololatriâ*, to be as much as *Peor Ab*, or *Father Peor*, (the same Idol being sometimes in Scripture called simply *Peor*, as well as with the addition of *Baal*,  
*Babal*

*Bahal Pebor*) but this conceit is evidently too far fetched, and after all Mr. Selden will not allow that *Priapus* and *Baal Peor* are the same, or at least he will not grant what this *Etymon* supposes that the *Greeks* were beholding to the *Moabites* and *Midianites* for their God *Priapus*; but the words of *Isidore* well considered, will help us to the true Original, they are these, L. 8. *Beelphegor interpretatur simulachrum ignominia. Idolum enim fuit Moab cognomento Baal super montem Phegor, quem Latini Priapum vocant Deum hortorum.* He tells you that *Priapus* was *Deus hortorum*, and that is well enough known, though *Isidore* had been silent, *Priapus* therefore is not *Pebor Ab*, but *Pri Ab* the *Father of Fruits*. And for this reason he is made to preside not only over *Gardens*, but *Ports* by the Sea side, because thither as to a common Receptacle, the fruitfulness and plenty of the whole World repairs; or because in the Sea there is a spirituous and volatile Salt, which is the Principle of life and fruitfulness in the world; from whence it is that *Venus* the Mother and supreme cause of all vital Fecundity among the *Heathens*, is called ἀφροδίτη, as being supposed to be born of the Foam or Salt spume of the Sea; and *Salax* in *Latin* is derived from *Sal*, and all the sorts of *Salsamenta* are known to be ἅλας ἀφροδιασκευαί. and in this sense *Priapus*, as in *Isidore's* notion he is *Custos hortorum*, so in the *Greek Epigrams* he is called λιμανίτης, which is as much as the *Greek Palæmon*, or the *Latin Portunus*, that is, *custos portuum*, a *Portus tuendis*, as *Neptunus* who is also the same, is not from Νεϋδών, in *Plutarch*, which I believe to be a word of no signification, though he interprets it to denote the *Sea shore*; but it is *nevitunus*, a *nevibus*, hoc est, *navibus tuendis*, as ναῦς and νῆς in *Greek* are the same, and *Nevius* the old *Latin Poet*, is certainly the same name with *Navius* the *Augur* in *Florus* and *Livy*.

And .

And as the Heathen Deities were usually called *Patres*, and *Genitores*, by which title the Self-existence and the Prolifick fruitfull nature of the Deity was signified; so also they are no less frequently stiled, *ἄναξες*, *Reges*, *Kings*, by which their dominion and sovereignty over all things was denoted; and as by the first of these that notion of the *Tetragrammaton* is fulfilled by which it is rendered *יְהוָה*, so by the latter that other signification of it from whence the LXX. have rendered it by an *Hebrew* word *אֱלֹהִים* is represented, both of which together are comprehended in *Κύριος*, as hath been already observed.

But this title though it be apply'd sometimes to the inferior Deities, as to *Apollo* in *Homer*, yet it most properly signified him who was as it were the King and Sovereign over the rest; so *Homer* invokes *Jupiter Ζῆν* *Ἄνα*. And *Juvenal*,

*Credo pudicitiam Saturno Rege moratam*  
*In terris ———*

From hence it was that from the *Hebrew Melech*, the *Ammonites* called that God whom they worshipped, who is supposed to be the same with *Saturn* or *Jupiter Latianus*, *Molech*, and *Moloch* and *Milcom*. And the *Sepharvaites* in the book of *Kings*, worshiping two supreme Beings, as the *Manicheans* afterwards did, the one the Author of all good, the other of all evil and mischief, called the one *Anamelech*, that is, the *Gracious King*, who was worshipped for his goodness, the other *Adramelech*, that is, the *Strong or Powerfull King*, who was feared and adored for his Power; to which among the *Carthaginians* with the addition of *Babal* instead of *Melech*, the names of *Annibal* and *Asdrubal* do exactly answer, and part of the signification of the latter of these is likewise to be found in *Adrumetum* a Colony of the

*Phœnicians* upon the Coast of *Africk*, which is not *Chatsarmaveth*, or *Chatsarmoth*, as *Drusus* and *Casaubon* after *Scaliger* would have had it, which opinion is sufficiently confuted by *Bochartus* himself; neither is it *Chatsar Maathan*, that is, *Regio Centum*, because it seems the Country thereabouts was so fruitfull as to produce a crop of an *hundred fold*, as *Bochartus* himself will needs have it. For *first*, when he translates *Chatsar* by *Regio*, he does not consider that *Adrumetum* was not the whole Countrey, but one particular Town upon the Coast. And *secondly*, when by the addition of the *Syriack Mathan*, he makes it to signifie a fruitfull Countrey, bringing forth an *hundred fold*; this is such an *Elliptical* way of speaking, as not being back'd by any other probability than the bare likeness of sound, would not have been allowed for a tolerable conjecture by *Bochartus* himself, had it been any other man's but his own; but it is the nature of Mankind to be fond of Monsters, Idiots and Cripples, so they be but of their own begetting.

It appearing therefore how slight and unsatisfactory *Bochartus* his conjecture is, I do humbly propose instead of it, *Adir Mot*, *Adir* is *validus, potens*, and is a part of the composition in *Adramelech* and *Asdrubal*, and *Mot* by *Philo Byblius* out of *Sanchuniathon* is sometimes rendered *ἰλὺς*, *lutum*, and sometimes *ὄμις* *μῆλας* *ὕδατος*, a mixture of Water and Earth together, a slimy or Marshy Land, a Fen or Bogg, in *English* we call it more exactly *Mud*, which may well enough be a *Phœnician* word, if it be true what *Bochartus* tells us, that the *Phœnicians* traded hither for *Lead* and *Tin*, and that from hence these Islands had their name of *Britain*, as in *Greek* they are called *νῆσι κασσιτέρεις*, the *Tin Islands*; so that *Adrumetam* is as much as *arx, præsidium, munimentum, propugnaculum, luto, aut aggere aut vallo cinctum*, which was the only way of fortification in the earliest times,

times, by mud walls and heaps of Earth thrown up together, like the fortification of the *Roman Camps*, or like the lines about *London* and *Colchester* in the time of the Civil War.

Thus it was that *Semiramis* fortified *Babylon*, for which, if it had not been, we should have had but little mention of her in the ancient Story; this action of hers being mentioned, as her greatest enterprize, by all that speak any thing concerning her, so that from thence she seems to have had her name. For *Chemir Ramis* is as much as *Lutum calcatum*, or *pressum*, in the language of the *East*; and it is particularly apply'd to *Walls* and *Fortifications* in the book of *Nabum*, c. 3. 14. *Draw the waters for the siege: fortifie the strong holds, go into clay and tread the mortar: make strong the brick-kilne.* Where what we render *tread the mortar*, is in the *Hebrew* *Rimfi bachomer*; so also in the building of *Babel* after the Flood, it is said, *Gen. 11. 3. They had brick for stone, and slime had they for mortar*; in the *Hebrew*, by a very pleasant παρανομασία it is thus: *Vatehi labem halebenah leaben vehachemar hajah labem lachomer.* 70. καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτοῖς ὁ πλῆθος εἰς λίθον, καὶ ἄσφαλτον ἠὲ αὐτοῖς ὁ πηλός.

And as a further confirmation of this conjecture concerning *Adrumetum*, it is to be considered that there was also another place, which was likewise a *Phœnician Colony*, which the *Greeks* call ἀδραμύτιον and ἀδραμύττειον, being either the same with *Thebæ Hypoplaciæ*, or very nigh it, and the *Bay* or *Promontory* upon which it stood was from thence called *Sinus Adramyttæus* (Κόλπος ἀδραμύττειος) this *Bochartus* himself, as to the latter part of its composition will have to be from the *Phœnician* מֶט, as much as *Chatfar mot*, that is, *Regio lutoſa*; but for his *Chatfar*, the former inconvenience returns, it being not the whole Countrey, but one particular Town which was called by this name. Wherefore I make no

question, but these being two places, both built by the *Phœnicians*, and both so very like in sound, that what little difference there is, may justly be suspected to have come rather from the corruption of the *Greeks*, than from the *Phœnicians* themselves; this, as well as the other, is no more than *Adir mot*, that is, *arx lutea*, which *Etymon* will receive infinite advantage of probability above that of *Bochartus*, from these two Considerations.

First, That besides what hath been said of the Names of *Asdrubal* and *Annibal* above, it appears, and may be proved that the very word *Adir* was a *Phœnician* word; so *Priscian* in his 5th Book makes *Abaddir*, that is, *Pater magnificus*, or *validus* or *potens*, to be the name of a God; and *St. Austin* in his 44th *Epistle* does peculiarly refer it to the Gods of the *Phœnicians*.

Secondly, There is no question but both of those places lying upon the Sea-Coast, and being intended by the *Phœnicians* in their Voyages for the convenience of Carrying, and Tallowing, and taking in fresh water, and trading up the Countrey, there was always a constant Garrison of *Phœnicians* in them both; and they were both of them places fortified as well as the skill of those times would allow, and this the word *Chasfar* was very unfit to express, it being expressly apply'd to Country Villages, and midland Cottages without walls, *Levit. 25. 31.* therefore all that is meant by *Adrumetum*, or *Atramyttium*, for they are both the same, is no more than a Garrison or place of strength fortified with a mud-wall; and so all these things do mutually strengthen and confirm one another.

Before I leave this digression, being got thus far out of my way, as it is very easie for any man to wander who is talking of matters of this nature, I will step aside a little farther, to take notice of an error of *Joseph Scaliger* and correct it. *Philo Judæus* in the life of *Moses*, says,



says, that among the *Ægyptians* Μῶς ὕδωρ σημαίνει, *Mos* is as much as to say *water*, and from thence he would have *Moses* to derive his name, because he was taken out of the *water*: this *Scaliger* rejects with the superciliousness of a Critick, and not without some signs of a triumphant insultation over the ignorance of *Philo*; in which after all he is but partly in the right, and partly mistaken: For I am of *Scaliger's* mind, that *Moses* had his name from *Maflab extraxit*, because he was taken or drawn out from among the *Flags* or *Bulrushes* by the *River* side, *Exod. 2. 10. And she called his name Moses, and she said, Because I drew him out of the water.* In which words, notwithstanding, the *action of drawing*, and the *place* from whence he was drawn, *the water*, seems to have had an equal share in the giving him his name; therefore if Μῶς at last do happen to signify *water* in the *Ægyptian* language, then *Scaliger* was very much mistaken, and *Philo* not so much as he would make him seem.

It is to be considered therefore, that he was not drawn out of the *mere fluid Element*, nothing but *water*, but from among the *Flags*, that is, a *marshy, slimy place*, which is the *Greek* πῦλος, and the *Latin* *Palus*, and answers exactly to the *Phœnician* Μῶτ, or Μῶς, for they are both the same, and do neither of them signify *simple water*, but what *Philo Byblius* calls ὁδὴν ὕδατος μίχρως, or τὴν γὰρ ὕδατι πικροχρόμην; so that though *Philo* in this do not altogether hit the *exact propriety* of the word, yet neither is he *altogether* mistaken, it being no more than what others have been guilty of as well as he; for what the *Hebrew* in the description of the *Primigenial Mass* calls *Tehom*, the 70 call ἄβυσσος, and both of them mean a confused jumble of *earth and water together*, but yet the *Greek Lexicographers* expound ἄβυσσος by ὕδατος πῦλος, and from thence it was that *Thales* had his opinion, that all things sprang out of the *water*. And



after all, since the *Ægyptian* language is utterly lost, and since *Maim* in *Hebrew* signifies *water*, which anciently, for ought we know, might be pointed *Moim*, if you consider the extreme likeness of a *Samech* and a *Mem* in the *Chaldee* or *Assyrian* Character, *Philo* may not be so much to blame as *Scaliger* would represent him; and besides those *Eastern* languages bating some words peculiar to each, differing only as *Dialects* doe from one another, we cannot at this day pronounce what allowance is to be made to *Philo's* interpretation, upon account of the difference of sound, arising from the diversity of *Dialect* in the *Ægyptian* and *Hebrew* Speech.

I could have furnished *Scaliger* with a better instance, to show how little skill *Philo* had in any of the *Eastern* Languages, being so unskilfull as he was in the *Hebrew* it self, as appears among other things by his interpretation of the word *Cherubim*, which he renders ἐπιγνώσεις καὶ ἐπισήμη ποδῶν. In which exposition of his he takes no notice of the *Caph*, which is a radical letter; and the *Nun* at the latter end, which is only a *formative* of the plural number is by him advanced into the dignity of a radical; the foundation of the conceit lying in this, that *Rab* is πολλός, and *Rob* is πλῆθος, *multitudo*, and *Boun* signifies ἐπιστήναι, ἐπιγνῶναι, from whence *Binah* answers to the *Hebrew* *Chochmah*, and to the *Greek* ἐπιστήμη, ἐπιστήσις; and yet this interpretation, as bad as it is, is as good as that of the *Rabbins*, who are the great pretenders to *Hebrew*, who will have *Caph* to be a servile letter, and the whole word to be as much as *Cherubia*, or *Cherabia*, because, forsooth, *Rabia* in *Chaldee* signifies a boy or youth, of which shape and appearance they will have the *Cherubims* to have been; whereas there is no question but the true derivation is from *Carab* to ride, which is particularly applied to *Spirits* and to *God himself* in *Scripture*, as in that place of the *Psalms* already cited,

68. 4. *Extoll him that rideth upon the heavens by his name Jah.* Of whom also it is said, 2 Sam. 22. 11. *He rode upon a Cherub, and did fly, and he was seen upon the wings of the wind.* And so because the *Cherubs* in the sanctuary were made with wings, therefore wings are attributed in Scripture to God himself, Psal. 17. 8. *Keep me as the apple of thine eye: hide me under the shadow of thy wings.* And in many other places.

Another manifest remainder of the punctation of the digrammaton, or two-lettered name of God by a *Cholem*, is the *Jo* of the *Latines* so frequently prefixed to the names of all their Gods, as *Jo Pæan*, *Jo Bacche*, *Jo Triumphe*, *Jo Hymenæe*; in which instances *Jo* is the general name of the supreme Numen, joyned to the particular Deities thereafter mentioned, who were all of them the supreme Numen under different notions, as the *Bafilidians* are found to have added the name *ἰάω* to that of their supreme Deity *Abraxas*: And this, if it will hold, as I see no reason why it should not, is a further confirmation of that explication of the seven-lettered name of God, which I have mentioned; that is, *ΙΕΥΩΙΑΩ*, in which *ἰάω* is added *exegetically*, to show that *ἰούω* is the name of the supreme Numen, as in *Abraxas*.

The *Mauritanians* worshipped their King *Juba*. *Minucius Felix. Et pejerante Proculo Deus Romulus, & Juba Mauris volentibus Deus est, & Divi cæteri Reges qui consecrantur, non ad fidem Numinis, sed ad bonorem emeritæ potestatis.* *Lactantius. Romani Casares suos consecraverunt & Mauri Reges suos. L. 1. c. 15.* And a little after, *Privatim verò singuli populi gentis aut urbis conditores, summâ veneratione coluerunt, ut Ægyptii Isidem, Mauri Jubam, Macedones Cabirum, &c.* And Mr. *Selden* would have it, that this *Juba* of the *Moors* was no other than the God of the *Hebrews*, the *Tetragrammaton* it self; perhaps so, if you consider the nearness of sound betwixt *Jehvab* or *Jehvah*,  
and

and *Jaba*, and the nearness of the *Pure Hebrew* to the *Punick* or *African* language; for as from *Havah* is *Jehvoh*, or *Jehvab* in *Kal*; so in *Hophal* it will be *Jubvoh*, or *Jubvab*, and by its *Passive* signification, it may denote the *stability* and *rootedness*, or *firmitude* of the divine Being.

Lastly, From *Zw* is the *Æolick* or *Dorick* Δω, from whence, according to the common way of declining, is Δα in the *accusative* case, that is, *Zab*, from *Jah*, as the *Doricks* express the Ζητα of the common *Dialect* by οδ, as in Κωαδω, Κωαδωδω, Σωρδω, Σωρδωδω, Αιαδω, Αιαδωδω, and the like.

But from all this I think there is abundant demonstration, whatever other ways of pointing there might be among the *Jews* or *Samaritanes*, or other Nations, that among the *Jews* themselves, the most ordinary and usual pronunciation of the *Tetragrammaton*, and that which the *Greeks* received from them, was *Ehjob* and *Jehvoh*, and that of the *Digrammaton*, which was most usual, was *Jah*.

I shall conclude this business with the words of Mr. *Selden*, though he knew nothing of what I have here declared, *Syntag. c. 1. de Diis Syris*, p. 208, 209. *Nec obijciat quis tam ἀπῆρτω aut ἀπεῖρτω nomen Tetragrammaton fuisse ut gentibus non innotesceret. Id quod viri etiam docti nimis pro concessio accipiunt, dum morem religiosissimum Judæorum in eo proferendo male interpretantur. Nonne enim Aramæis Idololatris non solum cognitum, verum etiam & prolatum legimus? Rabsakeh apud Esaiam c. 36. 15. Neque considerare vos faciat Hiskijahu in יידין dicens eruendo eruet nos יידין, sepiusque repetit. Quoties palam nomen illud, ut proprium nomen Dei prædicatur potissimum à Fere-miah יידין Zebaoth, & יידין nomen ejus, & nomen suum magnum idem appellat, ipse Deus Opt. Max. Exod. 6. 3. Jerem. 14. 26. Celatam prorsus sæculis antiquioribus & semper datâ operâ absconditam ejus pronuntiationem dicere,*  
est

est Rabbīnorum nugis nimium indulgere, qui etiam ad illud, Exod. 3. 13. Hoc est nomen meum Leholam, quod in perpetuum, juxta septuaginta etiam seniores vertitur, intelligunt, quasi redderes, hoc est nomen meum abscondendum, ita enim punctorum variatione Leholam sonare potest: Quomodo autem sæculorum ceteriorum Judæi ab ejus pronuntiatione abstinere; quam religiosissime semel quotannis, qui mos hodieque dicitur alicubi in usu, à sacerdote, expiationis festo proferretur, & id genus alia, passim apud Scriptores reperias. Necessarioque observes 70. seniorum versionem qui aut אֱלֹהִים aut קִיּוּן & semper pro הוּא substituunt. Vide quod de vetustâ quadam Synagoga Pragæ refert Buxtorfius in Radice Havah; Ego certè in hanc ita propendeo sententiam, Tetragrammatum nimirum nomen non absconditum à gentibus esse, ut & ipse Pythagoreorum τετρακτύς, contra quam interpretum turba id nominis fuisse autem; ita enim illi jussurandum concipiebant:

Ὁὐ μὲν τ' ἀμετρεῖς Ἰσὺς τετρακτύος τετρακτύς  
Πατρὸς δυνάς φύσις ἐξέματ' ἔχουσι——

In which words, which it is needless to translate at length, Mr. Selden affirms, and sufficiently proves by the instance of *Rabshakeb*, who frequently mentions and defines this Sacred Name, that it was not unknown to the Gentile world; and what he affirms of *Jehovah*, which I have proved to be its most common, if not its only pronuntiation, the same is likewise true of the name *Elohim*, which was as sacred as the other, and may as properly be called the *Tetragrammaton*, that this also was known to the *Heathens*, it being that very name by which God declared himself to *Pharaoh* and the *Egyptians* by the hand of *Moses*; and I think, though we had not Mr. Selden's Authority to vouch us, yet I have sufficiently proved it from the Monuments of the *Heathen*

Antiquity, which have so exactly represented all these three names, which in their original and root are all the same, of *Ebjoh*, and *Jebvoh*, and *Jah*, that the matter hereafter will not bear any longer dispute among learned men.

Secondly, Mr. *Selden* tells us, that the *seventy Interpreters* do always interpret יהוה by Ἀδωναι, or Κύριε, which are in *Greek* and *Hebrew* both the same, and do exactly answer to one another. From whence there are two things observable: First, That the *Rabbins*, who always point this name with the points of *Adonai*, unless when *Adonai* it self is joyned together with it, have manifestly borrowed this way of pointing from the rendition of the 70; notwithstanding they would fain make us believe that they are wiser than they, and that they are not beholding to them in any kind whatsoever. Secondly, We see how ancient this superstitious reverence for the sacred and incommunicable name has been, that the 70 have no where expressed it, by its proper Letters and Vowels, which is not only true of יהוה, but of יהוה, and יה too, though the last of these be expressed by יא in Ἀλλουσία; yet so, as that the Name of God is hid in the composition, and cannot be discovered by one not skilled in the *Hebrew* language.

Lastly, He tells us that the *Pythagorean Tetractys*, which was so great a secret in that School, was no other than the *Tetragrammaton* of the *Hebrews*, that is, the name *Jebvoh*; for this is that name which is generally called the *Tetragrammaton*, though *Ebjoh* in its *Hebrew* form (though not as represented by the *Greeks*) have as much right to it as the other.

And in this conceit Mr. *Selden* tells us he differs from the *interpretum turba*, the common croud of *Interpreters*, though neither is he singular in this conjecture; and if he had gone along with the croud, he had been less mistaken.

ken. For this is a very idle surmise of learned men to think that in this name there was any sacredness in the number *four*, since *Jah*, which consists but of two letters, was every whit as sacred as the other, and as peculiar to God, as incommunicable to any besides him, and as studiously concealed from the knowledge of the *Heathen World*, by the 70 Interpreters, as the other two, which have all of them the same Fountain and Origination.

The ground of this mistake does sufficiently confute it self; for all the reason of this conjecture is founded only upon this, That the name of God was called by the *Greeks Tetragrammaton*, which seems by its *sound*, and by the *signification* of its *number* to answer to the *Pythagorean Tetradys*; but they do not consider, though the *Rabbins* after the *Greeks* have called the same name in its original, *Shemsbel Arbah Othijoth*, as hath been already observed, yet the *Greeks* meant it only of the *idea*, that is, of the Name of God, not as kept *secret* from the *Heathen World*, but as *revealed* to it, as hath already been made appear; so that at this rate *Pythagoras* would have had but little reason to boast of his *Mystery*, which lay open to the view of all curious inquirers, as well of himself and his disciples; for the time of *Pythagoras*, according to *Livy* and *Dionysius Halicarnassensis*, falls above an hundred years lower than that of *Numa*, who was contemporary with *Hezekias*, being towards the latter end of the *Babylonish* captivity, or about the return from it; whereas *Sanchuniathon*, who had his information from *Gideon*, and who was the first by whom this name was communicated to the *Gentile World*, belongs to the interval of the *Judges*, before that which was usually reputed the oldest *Epoche* of time, *The Trojan War*, and within less than Two hundred years of *Moses* himself, to whom this Holy Name was first imparted.



Besides, that though *Sanchuniathon* were perhaps the first who did in writing divulge this name to the *Heathen World*, yet is it plain from what hath been said of its being communicated to *Pharaoh* himself and his *Ægyptians*, in the time, and by the information of *Moses* himself, that it was got abroad long before his time, and that it was no sooner imparted to the *Israelites* themselves, than *foreigners* were made acquainted together with them; neither is it probable when *Rabshakeh* so frequently ingeminates this blessed Name, that he received his knowledge of it, from the *Phœnician* Monuments of *Sanchuniathon*; but that it was then as publickly known, as it is now lost and forgotten, by being studiously concealed by the superstition of after-times, or by that common calamity, which the *Babylonish* captivity brought upon the *Jewish Nation* and Language together.

But after all, it is nothing but want of skill in *Grammar*, which hath been the reason hitherto why learned men have favoured this opinion, That the *Tetractys* and the *Tetragrammaton* are the same. For what is *Tetractys*?

It is to be considered that the *Pythagorick* Philosophy was used to explain all things after a *mystical* manner by *numbers* and *proportions*, in which *one*, or *unity*, or *Monas*, is the most simple, undivided, and perfectly indivisible root of all things; two, or what the *Pythagoreans* call the *Dyas*, is the first principle of multiplicity or composition, and both of these added together, make the number *three*; in which, if you suppose each unite, to be *one side* of an *æquilateral Triangle*, and then by counting the sides after the Triangle is built, you begin at any side indifferently *one, two, three*, you come then back again to that side from whence you set out; which being considered in two different respects, as the *terminus à quo*, and the *terminus*.



*terminus ad quem* of this computation; the whole Triangle is therefore called the *Tetractys*, because a Triangle returning into its head or fountain is the number *four*. And these numbers added to one another 1, 2, 3, 4. make the number *ten*, which is, as it were, the Universal Basis of infinite numeration.

But that in this I may not seem to represent my own fond conceits, instead of the truth and reality of the *Pythagorean Doctrine*, I will here produce a place of *Lucian* out of his *Blasphemy*, which will both confirm what I have said, and may be explained by it. Περὶ ἐπιταφίου ἀριθμοῦ. Αἰ. οἶδα καὶ νῦν ἀριθμοῦν. Πυ. πᾶς ἀριθμῶν. Αἰ. ἔν, δύο, τρία, τέσσαρα. Πυ. ὅρας ἃ σὺ δοκῶς τέσσαρα πάντα διὰ ἑν, καὶ τετραὶν ὀκταλῖς, καὶ ἡμῖτις ὀκτω. Αἰ. ἔ μοι τὸ μέγιστον τοῦτον ὄραον πρὸς τέσσαρα, ὅπου θεοτικῆς λόγος ἦκουσα, ὅδ' ἔ μάλ' ἔστιν ἱερός. It is a discourse between *Pythagoras*, who stood to be sold for a Slave in the Market, and the person who came to cheapen and buy him; *Pythagoras* tells him he was able to teach him *Musick*, *Geometry* and *Arithmetick*: *Arithmetick*, said he, *I understand that already*: Say you so, said *Pythagoras*; let me hear you number. At which he beginning to count, *one, two, three, four*: Do you see, said *Pythagoras*, that which you call *four*, is indeed *ten*, a perfect or *equilateral Triangle*, and the Oath of me and my followers. Then by that greatest of Oaths, the number *four*, said he, *I never till now heard such divine and excellent discourse as this*.

It appearing therefore by this place, that *four* in the *Pythagorick School* was as much as *ten*, and that it was usually compared to an *equilateral Triangle*, from hence we may see what is the meaning of the *Tetractys*; for as *tetras* is the number *four*, which was the first root and basis of all number and proportion, and consequently the great Principle of their natural Philosophy, . .

( For by *Μονάς*, or an *unite*, they mean a *material Atome*; and by their *Dyas* and *Trias* the first *complexions* of those *Atomes* with one another, as is manifest from the use of *Μονάς* in the *Anthology*.

————— Μάττω 'Επίκουρον ἔασον  
Πᾶ τὸ κενὸν ζητεῖν καὶ τίνος αἱ μονάδες. )

From hence it comes to pass, that *τετρακτὺς* is the *art* or *mystery* of resolving all causes and effects into the number *four*, or of explaining all the *Phænomena* of nature according to the *Pythagorick mode*. As *Κithάρα* is an *Harp*, and *Κθαρισὺς* derived from it the *art* or *skill* of playing upon the *Harp*, exactly according to the same Analogy.

*Homer.*

————— Καὶ Δάφνην, θῖβα τῇ Μῦσαι,  
'Αυτόμαται Θάμωρον τ' Ὀρήια πῦσαν αἰοδῆς,  
'Οιχαλιῆθεν ἵστα παρ' Εὐρύτου 'Οιχαλιῆθι.  
Στυγὸ γὰρ εὐχόμεθα νείεσθαι ὅππῃ αὖ αὐταὶ  
Μῦσαι αἰδοῦν, Κῆρυι Διὸς 'Αιγυόχοιο.  
'Αἱ δὲ χαλασάμεναι πρὶν θέσαν, αὐτὰρ αἰοδὴν  
Ὀλοπίσιν ἀρίλοντο καὶ ἐκλίλαθον ΚΙΘΑΡΙΣΤΥΝ.

Neither is it at all favourable to this groundless fancy, that the *Pythagoreans* were used to swear by the *Tetractys*, for they were used to swear by their *Master* himself, as hath been already noted out of Mr. Selden,

'Οὐ μὰ τ' ἀμετίεα ψυχῇ προαδόντα τετρακτύν.

And then at the same time they tell you plainly what this *Tetractys* was, Παγὰν ἀνάνη φύσεως εἰζώματ' ἔχουσαν, the source and fountain of everlasting or universal nature, or that which contained in it the roots and seeds, that is, the first principles of the *Pythagorick Physiology*, from whence it is plain that the *Tetractys* is to be understood in that sense which I have already explained. It

It is true that the Name of God in *Hebrew* did really consist of *four* letters; but yet it is equally true, that in that number there was no *Mystery* placed among the *Jews* themselves, who did not take any such religious notice of it, but it was afterwards by the *Greeks*, long after the time of *Pythagoras*, that it was called the *Tetragrammaton*; which yet notwithstanding had nothing more of sacredness or peculiarity in it, than the *Digrammaton* or Name of God, consisting of *two* letters, as hath been sufficiently proved.

Besides, the *Jews* did not use to Swear by the number *four*, and therefore the *Pythagoreans* could not have it from them, but by the number *seven*, for *Nisbbah* in *Hebrew* signifies to swear, whose root is *Shebah* signifying *seven*; and it is as much as to say, that they swear by him who in *six* days made Heaven and Earth, and all that therein is, and rested from his labours on the *seventh*. And as *Nisbbah* is to swear, so *Shebo-uah*, which signifies the *septenary number*, signifies also an *Oath*; that is to say, an Oath by him who completed the Creation in *six* days, and rested the *seventh*. This was also the meaning of those *seven* ewe lambs, which *Abraham* had set aside to be a witness between himself and *Abimilech*, that he had digged the well, Gen. 21. 28, 29, 30. That is, it was a *Symbolical* appeal to God as the witness of the Covenant between himself and *Abimilech*. This was also the meaning, not only of the *weekly Sabbath*, but also of the *Sabbatical years*, and of the years of *Jubilee*, which consisted of the *Multiplication* of the *Sabbatical period* by it self. The same account is also to be given, why the Solemnities of the *Passover*, *Feast of weeks* and of *Tabernacles*, consisted all of them of *seven* days, and why there were *seven* weeks to be numbred from the second day of unleavened bread, to the feast of *Pentecost*; it was a kind of *Jubilee* of *days*, as the other was of *years*, being to commence at the expiration of that

that term, which consisted of the *Paschal Festivity*, consisting of *seven days*, multiply'd by it self: This was the reason why of the clean beasts *seven*, by the Divine appointment, were to be admitted into the Ark; whereas of the unclean, there were to be but *two*; for that there were more than *two*, in the *General*, this depended upon this reason, that they were afterwards permitted for food as well as for sacrifice, and so it was necessary more of the *clean* kind should be preserved than the other; but that there were to be just *seven*, neither more nor less, this had a *mystical* allusion in it, and pointed at him, to whom as the author and finisher of all things in the space of *seven days*, the *seventh* was to be offered up in sacrifice when they came out of the Ark.

To the same *symbolical* account we must also put the number of *persons* that entred into the Ark, which were *eight* in all; but *Noah* is to be considered as distinct from the rest under the notion of a *Priest*; that as the World was created in *six days*, so it might be restored and replenished by *six persons*, *Noah's* three Sons and their Wives, while the *seventh*, that is, *Noah's* Wife, being now past Child-bearing, may be looked upon as now wholly devoted to the service of God, and may answer that *seventh* among the *clean species* of *Animals*, which was to be for sacrifice at their coming out of the Ark; or else the eight persons are the *septenary number* returning into it self, by including both the terms, as in the *Pythagorick Tetracltys*, and as in all those cases where the Feasts of *seven days* continuance among the *Jews* have sometimes *eight days* allotted to them, as hath been already taken notice of, that is, by including the *Terminus à quo*, that is, the παρασκευη, or preparation to the Feast into the number.

*Lastly*, This was the reason of *Circumcision* upon the *eighth day*, which is the space from *Sabbath* to *Sabbath*, in-

including *both* the terms, and by admission of the Males into the Jewish Church and Covenant upon that day, he was symbolically shadowed out, to whose service they were dedicated by that Rite, and into Covenant with whom they were admitted, which held not only in men, but in some sort was observed even in *brute animals* themselves, which could not be accepted untill the *eighth day*, that is, till they were full *seven days* old. *Exod.* 22. 30. *Seven days it shall be with his dam, and on the eighth day thou shalt give it me.* *Levit.* 22. 27. *When a Bullock, or a Sheep, or a Goat is brought forth, then it shall be seven days under the dam; and from the eighth day and thenceforth, it shall be accepted for an offering made by fire unto the Lord.* And Grotius observes out of *Pliny*, l. 8. c. 51. *Pecoris factum sacrificio purum esse die septimo*, that Sheep and Lambs are fit for sacrifice on the *seventh or eighth day*, and not till then; for that is plainly the sense of *Pliny*, whose words are these, *Suis factus sacrificio die quinto purus est, pecoris die octavo*, which confirms what I have said, that *seven* and *eight* in these instances are all one, the latter being only by inclusion of the two terms, or by the return of the *Septenary* or *Sabbatical period* into it self.

The same Grotius upon *Gen.* 17. 12. in which place the first institution of Circumcision is contained, uses a passage out of *Aristotle* in his 7th *de animalibus*, wherein he imagines the reason of Circumcision upon the *seventh or eighth day* may be found; where speaking of infants, he says, τὰ πλεῖστα δὲ ἀναίρεται πρὸ τῆς ἑβδόμης, διὸ καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα τότε τίθενται, ὡς πισύοντες ἤδη μᾶλλον τῇ σωτηρίᾳ; that is, *Children dye frequently before they be seven days old: Which is the reason why at that age they usually give them their names, having then some hopes, when seven days are past, that they may continue to live and doe well.*

And he also produces the opinion of *Maimonides*, why *Circumcision* was not performed till the *eighth day*, *Quia antè eum diem infirmior infans quàm ut par sit dolori*; Because before the *eighth day* the child was usually so weak, that this operation could not be performed without danger of life, or too great extremity of pain. But now that this reason of *Maimonides* is no reason at all, is plain from this, That the *Circumcision* was never anticipated, though the child should prove never so vigorous and strong, as it is plain there is great difference in the strength and vigour of children from the very birth, as well as afterwards, when they come to greater age; neither was it ever deferred any longer, though at the age of *eight days* the child should prove never so weakly and unlikely to live. This therefore instead of being a solid reason, is but a *Maimonidism* or a *Rabbinical dream*.

The same may also be said of *Aristotle's* reason, why children had their Names given them upon the *seventh day* among the *Greeks*, which term, if it were not by custom either anticipated or prorogued according to the differing degrees of health, which is the general account why the *seventh day* above others was pitched upon; then this was either no reason at all, or which is still worse, so very bad a reason, as does sufficiently betray and expose it self.

It is therefore more likely that *Aristotle* was mistaken in his account, and that the true Original of this custom was from the *Jews*, who were used upon the *eighth day* to perform the Ceremony of *Circumcision*; at which time also the Name was probably given to the child. And I think it may be pretty plain from all this, that the reason of *Circumcision* upon the *eighth day*, and of not offering up any animal in sacrifice till then, was the same in both cases, and had a mystical allusion to the *septenary number*,



number, or to the return of the *Sabbatical period* into it self, as an act of homage or obedience to him, who rested the *seventh* day, when he had finished the wonders of his Power, Goodness and Wisdom upon the other *six*.

From this custom of *symbolical swearing* by the number *seven*, or with the *Pythagoreans* by the number *four*; or perhaps from both of these causes it came to pass, that ἀριθμῶ in Greek, which signifies properly to *count* or *number*, is also found to have the signification of *swearing*, as appears by comparing two of the *Greek Scholiasts*, the one the *old Interpreter* of *Homer*, and the other of *Apollonius*, the *Writer* of the *Argonautiques*, together; that upon *Homer* is *Il. a. 264.*

Καίρια τ' Εξέδιν τε καὶ ἀντίβιον Πολύρμηλον.

Upon which the Scholiast saith thus: 'Ο δὲ Καίριος Ἐλάτιος μὲν παῖς, Λαπίθων δὲ Βασιλεὺς πρότερον λεῖ παρθένῳ Ἐπρεπῆς μεγίστῃ δὲ αὐτῇ Ποσειδῶνῳ, αἰτησαμένη μεταβαλεῖν εἰς ἄνδρα ἢ νεανίαν, ἀτρεπῆ γήνηται, γενναίηται τῶν καὶ αὐτὸν ὑπάρχας, καὶ δὴ πότε πῆξας αἰώντιον εἰ τῇ μεσσητῇ τῆς ἀγορᾶς; Οὕτως τὸτο προσέταξεν ἀριθμῶν, δι' ἣν αὐτὴν ἀγανακτήσας ὁ Ζεὺς τιμωρίαν τῆς ἀσεβείας παρ' αὐτῇ εἰσπράττειτο μαχόμενον γὰρ αὐτὸν τοῖς Κυνταύροις καὶ ἀτρεπῇ ὕπαι, ὑποχείριον ἐπὶ πόσι, βδελύσσοντες γὰρ αὐτὸν οἱ προσημνῶσι δ' αὖτις τε καὶ ἐλάταις ἡρῶσαν εἰς γαῖαν. Μιμνῆται δὲ αὐτῇ καὶ Ἀπολλώνῳ ἐν τοῖς Ἀργοναυτικοῖς λόγοις ὅτως; that is, *Ceneus* was the *Son* of *Elatius*, and *King* of the *Lapithæ*, once a beautifull *Virgin*; but being deflowered by *Neptune*, she requested of him, that she might be turned into a man; which request of hers was not only granted, but she became invulnerable into the bargain, and was the most redoubted *Hero* of that time; insomuch that



on a certain time fixing his Spear in a place where the Gods were to pass by, he would oblige them all to number, that is, to swear by his Spear; at which Jupiter was so angry, as well he might, that he resolved to be revenged, and immediately set the Centaures upon him; who though they could not pierce him, being invulnerable, yet made a hard shift to ram him down by the weight of massy Oaks and Asbes into the earth, of which Apollonius in his *Argonautiques* thus speaks; and then follows over again the very same Story, as it is told by *Apollonius*, where the *Scholias*t relating the same Fable, though not so particularly as the *Interpreter* of *Homer* does, what the first calls ἀριθμῶν, to number, he expressly renders by ὀμῶναι, to swear, ἔτι & ἐκλάει τὸς πάντας ὀμῶναι τὸ δέου αὐτῷ, he compelled all that came by to swear by his Spear. And then afterwards adds as the reason why Jupiter was so severe upon him, τὸτο δι' αὐτῷ συνέβη διὰ τὸ μὴτε θεῶν τοῖς θεοῖς, μὴτε θυχεῖται, ἀλλὰ τὸ αὐτῷ δέεσθαι. This calamity befell him, because he would neither sacrifice nor pray to the Gods, but only to his own Spear.

Neither does it necessarily follow, because the *Pythagoreans* were used to swear by the *Tetractys*, which implies indeed that there was something of *Divinity* in it, that therefore the *Tetragrammaton* was pointed at, or that any respect was had in it to the four letters, of which the Name of God, either in *Greek* or *Hebrew* was composed, but only to that root of number and proportion which I have mentioned, in which the seeds and principles of all natural Productions were contained, πηγάς αἰώνος φύσεως, the source and fountain of everlasting nature, which word nature is it self only one way of expressing the fruitfulness and plenty of the divine Being, in which as in their proper Fountain and Original, all the possibilities of things are in a powerfull and hidden manner contained, and

and from which their actualities proceed, so that *God* and *nature* are indeed but *two* words for *one* and the *same* thing.

*Hanc Deus & melior litem natura diremit,*  
said *Ovid*.

And *Seneca*, *Vis illum fatum vocare? non errabis: Hic est ex quo suspensa sunt omnia, causa causarum. Vis illum providentiam dicere? Recte dices: Est enim cujus consilio huic mundo providetur, ut inconcussus eat, & altus suos explicet. Vis illum naturam vocare? non peccabis: Est enim ex quo nata sunt omnia, cujus spiritu vivimus;* and other passages of a like import. And as *natura*, according to *Seneca*, is *ex qua nata sunt omnia*, so is *quous*, *ἡ ἡ πα παρτα ρου*, *καὶ τινος*. And this was that which by the ancient Heathen World, was worshipped and adored by the name of *Pan*. Neither would they have been any more blame-worthy, that they were used to swear by their Master *Pythagoras* himself, if it had been true what he pretended, and they too rashly believed, that he was indeed an immortal, self-existent and divine Person; For upon this supposition they went, whenever they made their appeal to him in swearing; and indeed it is ridiculous to swear by any thing, whole Omniscience cannot qualifie him for a witness to the imprecation, and whose Omnipotence cannot punish the fallhood, of a deceitfull Oath in the opinion of him that makes it.

*Ecce negas jurasque mihi per templa Tonantis,*  
• *Non credo, Jura, Verpe, per Anchialum.*

And the belief of his Divinity was occasioned partly by the mystical and extraordinary nature of his Doctrine, and partly by those strange Stories which he told of him-

self, or procured to be told by his Abettors, and which were no sooner told than believed by his followers and others; as of his perswading a Bear to abstain from the flesh of *Animals*, as himself and his Disciples did; his whispering to an Ox, and by that means prevailing with him to *abstain* from *Beans*; his calling an Eagle down from Heaven in the greatest height and swiftness of its flight; and after having stroak't and made much of it, letting it go again; his being saluted by *Caucasus*, and as others say by the River *Nessus*, when he swam over it with his Golden Thigh, with a *χαίρει Πυθαγόρα*, which was looked upon as a kind of testimony of nature to the Divinity of his person; his telling some Fisher-men as they were dragging their Net, before it came to shore, how many Fishes they should catch, and by a miraculous power preserving them alive when they were out of their own Element; his pretending to have lived in ages long ago past, to remember perfectly the *Trojan War*, and all the bodies he had past through from that time, till he came to set up for the Founder of the *Italique Sect*, and went by the name of *Pythagoras* in *Italy*; his telling before Ships came to shore what Freight they were charged with; his foretelling of Earthquakes, averting of Plagues, and stilling of Winds and Tempests; his being able at any time either to raise or allay the passions of men to any pitch or degree; his being seen on the same day to persons at an incredible distance from one another: All which, though they speak him no other than a very great Impostor, yet being believed, as impossible as some of them might seem, and as ridiculous as others, it could not be otherwise but that they must needs create in his followers an opinion of his Divinity.

Neither was *Pythagoras* himself the onely pretender, to such extraordinary feats, but his disciples also, *Empedocles*,

*cles, Epimenides and Abaris* did the same; and of the first of them it is certain, and may very well be presumed of the rest, that he had a very strong ambition to be thought a *God*, otherwise he would not have thought it worth his while to leap into *Ætna* to purchase the honour of being so esteemed. *Flaccus*,

—————*Deus immortalis haberi*  
*Dum cupit Empedocles, ardentem frigidus Ætnam*  
*Influit*—————

But as very ill luck would have it, he left his shoe behind him, and that betray'd his mortality and folly to the world; and what *Porphyrie*, out of whom I have excerpted these particulars, relates of these *Gentlemen* whom I have last mentioned; the same, or things equally incredible, are related by *Philostratus*, concerning *Apollonius Tyaneus*, who was himself of the *Pythagorean School*, and had the *fortune*, I cannot call it *good fortune*, of compassing that design which his Predecessour *Empedocles* had missed; that is, of being thought a *God*, and worshipped under that notion in the *Lararium* of one of the *Roman Emperours*.

But because I have made mention of *Pythagoras* his *Golden Thigh*, of which so many Authors have spoken; among which are *Lucian*, *Laertius*, *Ælian*, *Porphyrie* or *Malchus*, and others, which yet is in its literal sense so ridiculous and so impossible a figment, I will here explain what was meant by it in the *Symbolical Doctrine* of *Pythagoras*. It is to be noted therefore, that in the language of the *Eastern World*, where *Pythagoras* had conversed very much, and from whence he received a great part of his Philosophy; the *Thigh* was looked upon as an Emblem of *fruitfulness* and *generation*, and *Je-*  
*re-*

*rek* in Hebrew sometimes signified as much as τὸ αἰδοῦν ἡτοὶ γυναικῶν μορίον, which though it cannot be unknown to learned men; yet because *Daniel Heinfius* in his *Aristarchus*, has been pretty accurate in this observation, therefore I will set down his words as I find them, p. 13. *Qui orientem salutarunt, sciunt vocem Jerek, hoc est, femur, pro pudenda parte viri pariter & mulieris poni; ac de viri quidem, ut cum aliquoties, nam infiniti propè loci sunt, posteritas Jacobi Femur ejus dicitur egressa, Gen. 46. 26. Exod. 1. 5. ubi modo αἱ ἐξελθῶσαι ἐξ ἱαχῶς ἰαχῶ, modo εἰ ἐξελθόντις ἐκ τῶν μηρῶν αὐτῶ, Hellenistæ rediderunt: pro mulieris autem, ut cum ea pars jam ad conceptum minùs apta, μηρὸς διαπνικτικῶς ab iis dicitur, Num. 5. 21.— Et quis nescit locum illum, ἐκ τῶν ἐλθόντων Ἀρχὸν ἐξ Ἰούδα καὶ ἰγυμένων ἐκ τῶν μηρῶν αὐτῶ. & tale aliquid *Procopius* acceperat, cum notavit, ὅτι γὰρ μηρὸς τὸ σπέρμα ὀνομάζεται.— De *Gideone* cui plurimi fuisse filii dicuntur, ἐκ ἐκπεριβύμενοι ἐκ μηρῶν αὐτῶ, ὅτι γυναῖκας ὄντα πολλὰς, dicunt *Hellenistæ*; & *Sibylla*, cujus fragmentum *Theophilus* ad *Autolycum* commemorat,*

Ἐὶ δὲ γυναικῶν ὄλως καὶ φθείρεται, ἢ δύνατ' ἀνδρὸς  
Ἐκ μηρῶν μντερός τι θεὸς τιτυπόμενον ὦσαι.

Which words, for the sake of those that are learned, it is needless to translate; and for others, διὰ τὸ εὐσχημον, it is better they should remain, as they are, untranslated, that in this at least I may not seem to wander from my Text, πάντα εὐσχημένως καὶ κατὰ τὴν γένεσιν.

From hence it was that *Bacchus* in the *Heathen Mythology* was said to be taken out of the Womb of *Semele*, and sow'd up in *Jupiter's Thigh*, from whence he was called by the *Greeks* ἐνσπέρματος, which *Ovid* renders *insutus femori*. *Metam.* L. 3. Im.

*Imperfectus adhuc infans genitricis ab alvo  
Eripitur, patrioque tener, si credere dignum,  
Insuitur femori; maternaque tempora complet.*

That is, in plain English, no more than that *Bacchus* was *Jupiter's Son*, which may also be the meaning of the Greek *εὐαγγέλιον*, if after the usual trifling of the *Greek Grammarians*, instead of *εὐαγγέλιον*, you read it *εὐαγγέλιον*, which seems to have been the Original word from *Jerem*, *Femur*, and *Jo* or *Yah* the name of *God*.

This was also the reason why anciently in swearing, the person making Oath, was used to lay his hand under the *Thigh* of him by whom he was adjured, *Gen.* 24. 1, 2, 3, 4. *And Abraham was old, and well stricken in years, and the Lord had blessed Abraham in all things; and Abraham said unto his eldest servant of his house that ruled over all that he had, Put, I pray thee, thy hand under my thigh, and I will make thee swear, by the Lord, the God of Heaven, and the God of the Earth, that thou shalt not take a wife unto my son, of the daughters of the Canaanites among whom I dwell: but thou shalt go unto my countrey, and to my kindred, and take a wife unto my son Isaac. And again, Gen. 47. 29, 30, 31. And the time drew nigh, that Israel must dye, and he called his son Joseph, and said unto him, If now I have found grace in thy sight, put, I pray thee, thy hand under my thigh, and deal kindly and truly with me: bury me not, I pray thee, in Ægypt, but I will lye with my Fathers, and thou shalt carry me out of Ægypt, and bury me in their burying-place: And he said, I will doe as thou hast said; and he said, Swear unto me, and he swore unto him, and Israel bowed himself upon the beds head. Sebastian Munster upon the first of these places says thus, Jurabant veteres illi manu sub femore atque genitali parte posita, quod inde posteritas esset futura,*



atque ideo veluti res sacra haberetur; vel ut *R. Salomo* sentit, quod illuc esset signum Fœderis nempe circumcisio, vel quod hoc indicio dabatur intelligi potestas superioris, & promptus inferioris obsequendi animus, ut *Aben Ezra* autumat, dicitque hunc morem adhuc observari in terrâ *Indiæ*: That is, 'The Ancients in the East were wont to swear, by putting their hand under the thigh or genital part of the person by whom they were adjured, because that was, as it were, the Fountain from whence posterity was to spring, and was upon that account esteemed sacred; or as *R. Salomon* thinks, it was because in that part the Seal of the Covenant, that is, of Circumcision was made; or it was to denote the Power of the superior, and the cheerfull obedience of those that were subject to him, as *Aben Ezra* is of opinion, who saith likewise, that in *India* the same custom still obtains; the words of *Aben Ezra* himself, are produced by *P. Fagius* upon the same place, who afterwards adds of his own, *Quidam ex nostris hoc modo jurandi adumbratum ferunt Christum, qui ex Abrahamo oriturus erat.* 'There are some among the Christian Expositors, who believe Christ, who was to be descended of the loins of Abraham, to have been typify'd and shadowed out by this rite. *Grotius*, *Quasi dicerent, si fallam, ense tuo peream, nam ad femur locus ensis*, *Jud. 3. 16, 21. Psal. 45. 3.* 'As much as to say, if I swear falsely, or if I break my Oath, may I perish by your Sword, for the Sword was used to be girt about the thigh.

But as for *Munster's* three reasons, for so many there are; the first of them is trifling, because it is not a cause sacred and great enough to be the foundation of an Oath, (which is an act of divine Worship), or of any solemn Ceremony belonging to it.

The second of *R. Salomon's*, is like the reason of a *Rabbin*, that is, no reason at all, for it was not under the  
*prudenda,*



*puenda*, { *Quod verecundiae ratio non patitur, ut factum credamus* }, but it was under the *thigh* it self, properly so called, that the hand was used to be layed, as shall be proved by and by. Neither is *Aben Ezra's* reason, which is the *third*, any less *Rabbinical*, that is, *false, ridiculous* and *absurd*, than the other; for how the *thigh* was an *Emblem of superiority*, or the putting the hand under it a *symbol or token of subjection*, I do not understand; and *Aben Ezra* does not so much as pretend to prove, or so much as assert, which yet if he had, the affirmation of a *Rabbin* will signifie but little, that ever these things were actually made use of in such a symbolical way.

As for *P. Fagius* his account, in which also *Clarius* his *Transcriber*, as how should it be otherwise? agrees with him, that it was a *Typical* adumbration of *Christ*, who was to be descended of the loins of *Abraham*; it is to be observed, that this is at best but *precarious*, and is likewise opposed by very strong Reasons into the bargain: For, first, we find this rite again repeated c. 47. in the person of *Jacob*, for which though the same account may again be given; for *Jacob* also was a *Progenitor* of the *Messias*, who was more immediately descended from him, than from *Abraham* himself; yet the repetition of this rite speaks it rather to be a custom of those times, not founded upon any such particular reasons, as belonged only to *Abraham* and his family, but obtaining generally at those times and places; besides that when *Aben Ezra* tells us, *Vezeh bamishpat badajan bon beerets Hodo*, 'That this in his time was still a custom in the land of *India*: It is very strange, that a rite which in its first institution, was so peculiar to the family of *Abraham*, and had a particular respect to the coming of the *Messias*, who was to arise from thence, should yet obtain so generally all over the *Eastern* Countries; for that, I suppose, is to be understood by *Erets Hodo* in the language of the

*Rabbin*; or if *Aben Ezra's* Authority, shall be thought as little by any, in matter of Fact, as I have represented it in matter of Opinion, where Speculation and Judgment are concerned, (talents very rarely to be met with in that sort of men), to strengthen the Testimony of *Aben Ezra*, let us call in that of *Augerius a Busbeck*, a man of unquestionable credit and reputation; who in the fourth of those excellent Epistles, wherein he gives an account of his Embassy from the *Emperour* to the *Grand Seignior*, and of what he observed, or heard, or what Occurrences fell out during that time, and speaking in this particularly of a *Turkish Hoggia*, of whom he there tells a pleasant story, taking leave of a *Bassa*, by whom he had been, together with many others, plentifully entertained, he says, *Nam remitteret paulisper, valedicturus hospiti, necesse erat, quod eorum ita ferat consuetudo, ut manibus ad pectora vel ad femora applicatis suos optimates salutet.* 'Being about to take leave of his Host, it was now high time for him to shut up his pouch, which he had been busie in filling with good provender to carry home; and the rather because he would have need to make other use of his hands, this being their perpetual custom among the *Turks*; that being to take leave of their *Superiours*, as a token of respect, they always lay their hand upon their *breast* or *thigh*; and so having made their obeisance, take their leave.

From which Citation of *Busbequius*, in concurrence with the testimony of *Aben Ezra*, there are several things very well worth observation: As first, that this was and is a *general token of respect* in the *Eastern Countries*.

Secondly, The outward expressions by gesture, of *civil respect*, and of *divine worship*, being generally the same in all Ages and Nations, as shall be proved more largely in its due place; the difference between these two, consisting only in the difference of the object, and the different appli-

application or direction of the mind in the one and the other; and it having been shewn already out of the *unquestionable Records* of *Moses* himself, that some such ceremony as this was used in *Divine Worship*, of which every *Oath* is a part (it being an acknowledgment of the divine Omniscience, and of his Justice and Power, it including an Appeal to the *former* as a witness, and a Prayer to the *two latter*, so to exercise and dispose themselves either for our benefit or hurt, as we assert truly, or perform faithfully, what we affirm, deny or promise); it is manifest that this Modern custom of the *Eastern Countries*, is the best explanation of that ancient usage, of which we have given instances in the Story of *Abraham* and *Jacob*; and that therefore *R. Salomon's* interpretation must needs be false, it being clear that in this Citation of *Busbequius* the word *Femur* is to be understood in its most proper, strict and natural acceptation.

Thirdly, By comparing this testimony of *Busbequius*, with the *two places* of *Genesis*, which we have mentioned, it appears how much *Josephus* was mistaken, who in his *Antiquities*, L. I. c. 16. gives this account of that Story of *Abraham*, which is to be found in the first of those places, ἡ πρεσβύτατος πύμπη τῶν δικτῶν ἐπὶ τῷ μυσείῳ, ἐγγράμμεθα μεγάλας τίσεις, γίνονται δὲ αὐταὶ τῶν ἡρώων, ὑπὸ τῆς μητρὸς ἀλλήλους τὰς χεῖρας ἐπαγαγόντες, ἐπικαλῶνται ἡ ὁδὸν μαρτυροῦσα τῶν ἐσσομένων; that is, he (*Abraham*) sends or dispatches his eldest servant to make up the contract betwixt *Isaac* and *Rebekkah*, obliging him by the most sacred ties imaginable, punctually to observe his instructions; now the manner of imposing such solemn and sacred ties, is this; The party obliging, and the party obliged, do both of them mutually put their hands under their thighs, and shaking hands after that manner with one another, they invoke God as a witness of what passeth between them, or of what the one requires to be done, and the other

other promises to doe; than which there can be nothing more contrary either to the exprefs words of *Scripture*, or of *Busbequius*; by the *first* of which the *ancient usage* is expreffed; and by the *second* the *continuance* of it in these latter times; but on the contrary, it is as plainly asserted, as it is possible for words to exprefs it; that all that was done was, that the party adjured was used to put his hand upon, or under the *thigh* of him, by whom the adjuration was made; and if you consider that in the instances of *Abraham* and *Jacob*, they were both of them *bed-ridden* and *lying along*, while *Eliezer* in the *first* example, and *Joseph* in the *second* stood by the *bed side*; such a way of shaking of hands, as *Josephus* describes, though it be not impossible, must needs be extremely difficult and painfull to the party standing by the *bed side*, as will be easie to imagine, to any that shall but fancy in their minds the posture in which the adjured person must be, with respect to him who lay along in his bed. Wherefore we must attribute this misrepresentation of the matter; either to the ignorance of *Josephus*, or to an affectation which he had of dressing up the *Hebrew* customs in the Garb of the *Greek* and *Roman*, among whom *joyning of hands* was always used, as a way of plighting of faith, that so he might the better accommodate his History, to the approbation and good acceptance of those for whom it was intended; but let it be either way, it argues either want of *honesty* or *skill*, either of which are sufficient to weaken his authority and credit to that degree, that his high pretences to integrity and skill, as if he scorned to deceive, and could not be imposed upon; being so very skilfull, that at a *very tender age* the *Priests* themselves were used to consult him in difficult and doubtfull cases (which they that please may believe) are so far from supporting his tottering reputation, that compared with such failures, either out of ignorance or design of these,

these, they do but still speak him more plainly either an unwary or unlearned Writer; and indeed how is it reasonable to expect much of *sincerity* from him, where he may either serve the interest of his Nation, or the credit of his own Eloquence and Parts, with which he must be acknowledged to have been very plentifully furnished, by putting false colours and artificial lights and shades upon his Story, when he gives so *excellent*, nay, so *divine* a Character of our *Saviour* himself; for he questions whether he were a mortal man or no, and was in that respect under greater convictions than any of the *Soci-nians* of our days can be, and yet was not persuaded to become one of his followers and disciples; not that I would be so understood, as if I would utterly destroy the authority of his Writings; but I say there is care and judgment to be used in distinguishing his truth from his mistakes, or his impostures.

And first in the *general* we may and ought to believe, that his main intention was to write truth, because there was no reason why he should do otherwise, and because to do otherwise too palpably and too often would have exposed him to the just indignation and hatred of his own Nation, and he would have been confused and exposed into the bargain. And lastly, because he that out of vanity, affectation or design would effectually deceive sometimes, must be sure for the most part to be a religious observer of truth, that so under the protection of his integrity, his fallhood may pass with the less examination.

Secondly, The far greatest part of his Story is attested by the concurrence of the sacred Writings together with it. Lastly, As there are some falsities so palpable, that they expose and betray their own shame and nakedness to the world; so also there are other relations that carry such *signatures* of probability in themselves, as are a tolerable

rable testimony to their own reality and truth; so that it is plain by all this, I do not so much design to expose the credit of this Writer, as to establish what is credible in him upon a more certain foundation.

The last opinion which is to be considered, is that of *H. Grotius*, *Quasi dicerent, si fallam, ense tuo peream*; that is to say, that this rite of laying the hand of the adjured person upon the thigh of him, by whom the adjuration was made, was as much as to say, *If I deceive you, or if I break that Oath which I am now making, may I perish by your Sword*, that being the place where the sword is used to be girt: But really, to speak the most favourably of this interpretation, it is a conceit by no means suitable to the name of him that made it, *ὡς γὰρ ὁ λόγος μέλον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἔργον μέγας*. For certainly it would rather look like a jeer or scoff, more like a sarcastical insultation over the infirmity of a bed-ridden and dying man, than like a solemn and serious appeal to the Omniscience and Justice of God, to say, *May I perish by your Sword*, when he had no strength to wield a Sword; and by reason of old age, an incurable disease, was never like to wield it any more; or would not the *symbolical* meaning at this rate be rather, as much as to say, *I never intend to keep my word, because I imprecate only such curses upon my self in case I break it, from whence I have no reason to apprehend any danger?*

Having therefore seen how unsatisfactory all these solutions are, that which I propose instead of them, is this; That it having been proved that the *thigh* in the *Symbolical* or *Hieroglyphique* language signified *fertility* and *generation*; the meaning of that expression of *Abraham* and *Jacob*, *Put, I pray thee, thy hand under my thigh*\*, is as much as to say, *I adjure you by the Father and Maker of all things*: *Ἐξουσία οὐ καὶ πάντων πατέρων*  
καὶ



καὶ κτιστὸν, ὅς κατὰ τὸ τὰ πάντα ἐξ αὐτοῦ ποιήσεται, καὶ δημιουργήσεται, and that this is truly and plainly the meaning of it, appears sufficiently from the first of these places it self, *Gen. 24. 2, 3. Put, I pray thee, thy hand under my thigh, and I will make thee swear by the Lord, the God of Heaven, and the God of the Earth.* And so in that passage of *Busbequius*, when the *Turks* in their customary salutation of their *superiours* apply their *hand*, either to their *breast* or *thigh*; by the first of these there is *symbolically* denoted, an appeal to him who is the *searcher of hearts*, that they do heartily wish and pray for the health and safety of him to whom this salutation is made; and in the latter there is included a *Prayer* to the *Father and Maker of all things*, that he would continue to prosper and preserve him.

Neither is it at all material in this affair, that where-as the present custom in *Turky* is to lay the hand *upon* the *thigh*, the *Hebrew* word in these places of *Genesis* is *Tachath*, which the 70 render by ὑπὸ, and our translation by, *under*, for *Tachath* in *Hebrew* is of a much larger signification than so, and may signifie in general, *in loco femoris*, that is, either *subter* or *super*; and therefore it is most rational to expound it from the Modern custom, which is, no question, a remainder of antiquity, and to understand the ὑπὸ of the *seventy*, rather in an *Hellenistical* sense, as being co-extended to the signification of *Tachath* in *Hebrew*, than in its *proper* and *genuine* acceptation.

But to make it the more clearly out, before I apply it to the instance of *Pythagoras*, that this was indeed a *symbol* of *generation*, and that the use of this rite in *solemn adjuration* did include an appeal to the *Maker and Parent of the World*. I will add some other testimonies both out of the sacred and prophane Writings, *Gen. 30. 3. And she (Rachel) said, Behold my maid Bilhah, go in*



unto her, and she shall bear upon my knees, that I may also have children by her : And c. 50. 23. And Joseph saw Ephraim's children of the third generation: the children also of Machir, the son of Manasse were brought up upon Joseph's knees. In both which places by Bilha's bearing upon the knees of Rachel, and by the children of Machir, the son of Manasse being brought up upon the knees of Joseph, nothing else is meant, but that the off-spring of Machir and of Bilhab, were accounted as descended of Joseph and Rachel, while they were yet living; the one *virtually*, in as much as Manasse, the Father of Machir was the son of Joseph, the other by a sort of adoption peculiar to the Eastern Countries and to the earliest times, whereby the children of the handmaid, begotten by consent of the Mistress, by her Lord and husband, were accounted as if they had been born of her self, as appears by those words already cited, *She shall bear upon my knees, that I may also have children by her* : And the same thing appears likewise from v. 6, 8, 11, 13. of the same chapter : And in the case of Hagar the handmaid of Sarah, Gen. 16. 2.

By what means the Mistress was invested with this propriety in the off-spring of her handmaid, I have declared in my Papers of the *Leviratical Law*, which was an usage every whit as ancient as this, and built exactly upon the same foundation: but all that I now take notice of, is the symbolical way of expressing this impetative generation, by *bearing*, or being *brought up* upon the *knees* of the person to whom the propriety belonged.

This was likewise the reason that in the ancient way of the most humble supplication, the person supplicating was used to take hold of the *knees* of him or her to whom the supplication was made, which included in it a *symbolical* intimation of a prayer or adjuration by the *Maker*  
of

of Heaven and Earth, that the request might be granted; this *Homer* calls, γινώσκειν and λαμβάνειν γένον, and the *Latin Writers*, amplecti, prensare gēna, genibus ad-  
volvi, genibus manus admove, and other expressions of a like import; but *Seneca in Troade* has expressed it a little otherwise, where *Andromache* thus speaks to *Ulysses* in behalf of her son *Astyanax*,

————— Ad gēna accido  
Supplex, Ulyssē, quāque nullius pedes  
Novere dextram pedibus admoveo tuis.

Where what he calls *gēna* in the beginning of these words, he afterwards calls *pedes*, because in this affair *pes*, and *femur*, and *genu*, are of the same import. So *Gen.* 49. 10. *The Sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a law-giver from between his feet, untill Shilo come*, where the 70 have it, עַל רַגְלָיו מִשְׁעָבֶה אֲוִרָה, as hath been already observed.

Lastly, This was the ancient meaning of *bowing the knee*, whether in divine worship or civil respect; in the first of which it was a *symbolical* acknowledgment of the *Prolifque* and *Demionurgique* nature of God; in the second it includes a Prayer to the *Maker and Conserver of all things*, for the health and prosperity of the person to whom the salutation is made; and if to this I may add, what though it be most obvious in it self, yet it did not till just now come into my mind, that γένον and *genu* have their very names from *generation*; from all this I will conclude, that the *Golden Thigh* of *Pythagoras*, being in the *literal* acceptation, a most ridiculous and absurd signment, was in the *symbolical*, an assertion of his *Divinity*; the *fruitfulness* of the divine nature being signified in general by the word *μυεός* or *thigh*, and by its being made of *Gold*, the *perpetuity* and *stability* of that *fruitfulness*

was denoted : So that it is not much to be wondred, when he made such large and lavish pretences to a divine and self-existent nature, if by his disciples, who were used to submit to him in all things with an implicit Faith and Obedience, he were worshipped under the Name and Character of *Apollo Hyperboreus*; or if the *Metapontini* and the *Tauromenii* built Temples and Altars to his reputed, though mistaken, Godhead, after his decease.

From whence he received this *symbolical* way of expressing that Divinity to others, which he arrogated to himself, is, I think, by this time, sufficiently plain; and though I may pretend to have proved, that it is but a vain conceit of some very learned persons that *Pythagoras* borrowed his *Tetractys* from the *Tetragrammaton* of the *Jews*, or rather *Greeks*, or *Hellenists*, who lived long after *Pythagoras* his time; yet I am far from denying that he had any knowledge of the *Jewish* affairs; his *symbolical* way of *Philosophising* in the *general*, and this *particular* instance of his *Golden Thigh*, are sufficient testimonies of his having no inconsiderable acquaintance in the *East*; and *Porphyrie* tells us expressly out of *Diogenes* in his Book, περὶ τῶν ὑπὲρ Θάλασσαν ἀπίστων, of the wonders or incredible rarities of the *Thule*; ἀρίκατο καὶ πρὸς Ἀιγυπτίους καὶ πρὸς Ἀραβας, καὶ Χαλδαίους καὶ Ἑβραίους, that he travelled among the *Egyptians*, *Arabs*, *Chaldees* and *Hebrews*; which is likewise asserted by *Clem. Alexandrinus*, *Eusebius* and *St. Austin*; and not only so, but if we will believe *St. Ambrose*, it was the received opinion of a great many that he was descended of the *Jewish* Nation. And what is still a farther confirmation, how little a stranger *Pythagoras* was to the Nation, Manners and Religion of the *Jews*; the same *Porphyrie* tells us, ἐν τῇ Βαβυλωνίῳ τοῖς τ' ἄλλοις Χαλδαίοις συνήλκετο καὶ πρὸς Ζάβεχτον ἀρίκατο, παρ' ἧ καὶ ἐκαθάριον τὰ τῇ προτέρῃ βίβλιν λόματα, καὶ ὠδοχόησεν ἀπ' ἧ ἀγνίαν προήκει τὸς ἀσσοδαίους, ἧ τῇ περὶ  
ρίστους

ἐξουίας ἄλλων Ἰουδαίων καὶ τῶν αἰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἀρχαί. *In Babylon he conversed, as with other of the Chaldeans, so with Zabratius himself, by whom he was purified from the pollutions of his former life, and was taught what abstinence was required of all that will be vertuous men; he was instructed likewise by the same person in the knowledge of nature, and of the principles or causes from whence this Universe is made, or by which it is preserved.*

This Zabratius, by *Clemens of Alexandria*, is called *Nazaratus*, by *Cyrril* against *Julian*, *Zaran*, by *Plutarch*, *Zaratas*, and by *Theodoret* *Zaradas*, but for the *Nazaratus* of *Clemens*, *L. Holstenius* conceives, that the first syllable is only the last of the preceding word carelessly repeated by the Transcriber, which is a very good conjecture, and like so expert a Critique as *Holstenius* was; or it might be that the same carelessness might repeat the first syllable twice, as it often happens that by negligence, the same syllable, word, and sometimes an entire clause or sentence is twice repeated; by which means it wou'd be *Zazaratus*, which looking like an uncouth name, and considering the likeness of *Z* and *N* in the larger character, the one being but the transverse of the other; and considering, lastly, that there was such a place in the world as *Nazareth*; all this running in his mind, who first bestow'd that reading upon us which the present copies embrace, he changed the *Zaratus* of *Clemens*, which was improved into *Zazaratus* by the Transcriber, into *Nazaratus*, which he looked upon to be as much as Ναζαρεθῶν or Ναζαρεθῶν. The *Zaran* in *Cyrril*, who is beholding to *Clemens*, is partly owing to an abbreviation very frequent in all ancient MSS. by which unskillfull Transcribers are deceived; and partly to this, that *N* and *Σ* have so great a likeness and resemblance to one another, which was the reason that in some of the Copies of *Tertullian*, the God of the *Basilidians*, instead of *Abraxas*,

*Abraxas*, is called *Abraxan*, which though at first it confirmed me in my conceit, that *Abraxas* was a composition of 'Αβραμ and Ζᾶς, because he is likewise called Ζᾶν, as hath been seen already; yet that conjecture, for the reason above mentioned, falling to the ground, it is manifest that this is a corrupt and putid reading, because the whole mystery of that name consisting in the *numeral potestas* of those letters of which it is composed, if you put an N instead of Σ, it will fall very short of that number in which the whole mystery consisteth.

For the *Zaratas* of *Plutarch*, and the *Zaradas* of *Theodoret*, they are both the same with one another, and with *Zabratus* in *Porphyrie*, or *Malchus*; for τ and δ are ἀντίστοιχα, letters very nigh of kin in their sound; from whence it comes to pass, that both in the use of common speech, and by the mistake of Writers, whose ears are not always so accurate as to distinguish, they are very often changed into one another; but the reading by a τ is indeed the true, as shall be seen by and by, and the β was omitted by *Plutarch* and *Theodoret*, εὐωνίας χᾶριν, to mollifie the word into the softness and Elegance of the *Greek* pronunciation.

So then all this diversity of reading, being so naturally and so fairly reducible to the *Zabratus* of *Porphyrie*, the remaining question is, who this *Zabratus* should be, which is the thing I am now about to explain. *Zabratus* therefore is *Jah Berith*, the God of the Covenant, as the salt of the Sacrifice is called the salt of the Covenant; and God frequently calls himself in Scripture, the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob; that is, he who had entered into Covenant with them and their posterity, and circumcision was the peculiar seal of that Covenant betwixt God and them; neither is it any matter in this case that *Porphyrie* calls this *Zabratus*, a *Babylonian*, because the time of *Pythagoras* falls, as I have said,

said, towards the conclusion of the *Babylonish* captivity, and so the names of a *Jew* and a *Babylonian* might well enough at that time be confounded together, because of their being mingled and interspersed among one another. *Zabratius* therefore, notwithstanding he calls him a *Babylonian*, may be understood of the *God* of the *Jews*, and his converse with him, may be meant of that part of his Philosophy or Discipline which he learned out of the *Mosaic Law*, either by a perusal of the Law it self, which I scarce believe, for want of acquaintance with the language, which was then in a manner lost among the *Jews* themselves, or by converse with the *Jews*; who though they had not now any accurate knowledge of the Law, yet were able to give him some *traditionary* and *imperfect* account: And this I the rather believe, because all the three things which *Pythagoras* is said to have received from *Zabratius*, are largely insisted upon in the Books of *Moses*, that is to say, the *Origine of all things*, in the first Chapter of *Genesis*, the *distinction of foods or abstinence from unclean things*, in the History of the Flood, and afterwards in the Body of the Law it self; and, lastly, *the rites and ceremonies of lustration*, which are no where more nicely adjusted than in the *Levitical Law*.

And if in these particulars he be not in every thing conformable to the platform of *Moses*, yet this is no argument that he had no knowledge of that Law, or of the Religion and Manners of the *Jews*, but only that it was *traditionary, confused and obscure*; besides that, there are two other causes which might and did probably conspire to make a variation as to particular instances, though the *Genius and Spirit* of the *Pythagorean Philosophy*, were much the same with that of the *Mosaic Law*.

First out of a particular affectation to be the founder of a Sect, and to be thought, as well by himself, as others, to have been the inventor of a *new Doctrine*, and the introducer.



roducer of a new Philosophical institution into the World.

Secondly, He did not only converse with the *Jews*, but with all other *Eastern Nations*, and so his Philosophy was probably little more than a Medley of the *Hieroglyphique* and *Symbolique* Mysteries of divers nations (as all the Philosophy and Religion of the East was wrapped up in *Symbols*) jumbled into a Philosophical *Oglio* together. It was much such another thing in *Philosophy*, as the *Phœnician History* of *Sanchuniathon* was for an account of time, where there are many very plain and undoubted strictures of true and genuine antiquity, jumbled together without any regard either to truth or shame, (though I do not say the composition of *Pythagoras* was equally frivolous and indiscreet) with the *Heathen Mythology* of all the barbarous Nations and fabulous times.

But after all, though the converse of *Pythagoras* in *Babylon*, be at the same time an argument of his acquaintance with the *Jews*; yet it may well enough be, that that knowledge, which he is said to have received from *Zabratius*, may be only a Transcript out of the sacred Volumes in the Temple of an Idol, such as that which by the *Midianites* and *Amalekites* in the book of *Judges*, was called *Babal Berith*; for as *Babal*, though it be for the most part apply'd to the signification of an *Idol*, may yet notwithstanding in its genuine and first acceptation denote and signify the *true God*; so may *Jab* also, which is the *proper* and *incommunicable* name of the *true God*, who is only self-existent, and is what he is from himself, be apply'd not improperly, by the *Heathens* themselves to the most contemptible and silly *Idol* in the world; because let it be what it will in it self, it is looked upon by them that worship it, under the notion of a *true* and *proper Deity*, and that it was actually apply'd to the *Idols*



of the *Heathen*, I shall immediately make appear; and and if I do, it will then, I hope, be granted, for another reason besides what hath been already urged, that this *incommunicable* name of God, which is every whit as sacred as the *Tetragrammaton* (and consequently that also), was not so great a secret among the neighbour Nations, as the *superstition* of the later *Jews* would make it.

So then *Zabratus*, though it may most properly and fitly be understood of the true God, yet nothing hinders, but a false one may also be signified by it; and at that rate it will be the same with *Baal Berith*, whom *Philo Byblius*, the Translator of *Sanchuniathon* calls Βασιλεύς Βερυτίων, the King of *Berith*, or of the *Berytians*, and whom he confounds very unskilfully with *Abibalus*, which was the name of the true God, and was, I make little or no question, the same with *Yéw*; the words of *Philo* in *Eusebius* are these: Σαγχανίδαν δ Βερυτίου, εὐκρινὲς τὸ ὑπομνήματι παρὰ Ἱερομβάλου τὸ Ἰεῶν τὸ Ἰεῶν, ὃς Ἀβιβάλου τῷ βασιλεὶ Βερυτίων τῷ ἱεροῦ ἀναθεῖς, &c. In which words, when I consider what a strange *Miscellany* that History of *Sanchuniathon* was, and as it seems a designed imposition upon the credulity of after-ages; I cannot but believe, that this *Abibalus*, whose name does so exactly hit to the pat and proper signification of the true God, was one of those names by which he was used to be called. For what is *Abibalus*, but *El Abib*, that is, *Deus spicarum*, as he was called from changing the beginning of the *Jewish* year, to the month of *Abib* from *Tisri*, of which so much hath been already spoken? And that which confirms me very much in this conjecture, is one of these four things which follow, and much more all of them together.

First *Eusebius* saith, ὃς Ἀβιβάλου τῷ βασιλεὶ Βερυτίων τῷ ἱεροῦ ἀναθεῖς, which if you understand of a *dedication*, such as hath been usual to great persons in the more civil-  
 Q 9

lized

lized and learned times, I doubt it will be hard to find any instance of *such a dedication* at a time, when *letters* themselves were scarce known in the world, and without being able to produce an instance, it is very absurd and ridiculous to suppose it; you may suppose any thing else, though never so extravagant, with equal reason. But if you will understand it so, as that the Monuments of *Sanchuniathon* were lay'd up in the Temple of *Abibalus*, which is the most proper sense of ἀντιθέσθαι and ἀντι-*θεμα* in *Greek*, then, let the thing it self be true or false, here is a kind of a confused and obscure acknowledgment that *Abibalus* was the name of a *God*; which since he cannot be the same with the Βασιλεὺς Βερυθίων, whether you understand by those words the *King* of the *Berytians*, who was a *mortal man*, or the *Idol* of *Baal Berith*, to which the *Etymon* of *Abibalus*, will not so well suit as to the *true God*, here is one, though a faint and obscure indication, that *Abibalus* was the name of the *true God*.

Secondly, We meet with other compositions exactly of the same form and analogy with this, in the Monuments of the *Eastern Antiquity*; For as the *God* of the *Hebrews*, for the reason above mentioned, was by the *Phœnicians*, or by the men of *Berith* called *Abibalus*, so by the *Ægyptians* *Neptune* was called Μωσνλ, from *El* and *Mos*, which signifies *water*; exactly by the same Analogy with the other, as *Tetzels* hath recorded, which is a new argument against *Scaliger* in his Controversie with *Philo Judæus*, which is likewise backed by the testimony of *Josephus*, who saith, that among the *Ægyptians* *Mos* or *Moy* hath the signification of *water*.

Thirdly, It matters not, though this name be no where found in Scripture, for the *Phœnicians* called even those *things* and *persons*, for whose knowledge they were indebted

debted either to the Scripture it self, or to a Tradition derived from it, by names of a very different sound, from those by which they were called in the books of *Moses* themselves, though by their signification, as in this instance of *Abibalus*, they did sufficiently discover from whence they came. So *Isaac* was called *Ἰσὺδ*, that is, *Jachid*, as being the *only son*; *Sarah*, *Annobret*, that is, *Quæ per gratiam concepit*, as having conceived and brought forth in her old age, when it had *ceased to be with her after the manner of women*; and the *breath of God*, which is said to have been breathed into the *nostrils* of the *first man*, is called *Κολπιζ*, that is, *Kol phi Jah*, *Sonus*, or *Sibilus oris Dei*.

Fourthly and lastly, If we consider the distance of the age of *Sanchuniathon*, from that of his Translator *Philo*, who flourished in *Adrian's* time, it may seem very probable, that the language out of which he made that Translation was not so perfectly understood by him, but that he might be guilty of many and great mistakes; so that if to the unskillfullness or wilfull errors of the original, you add the defects and failures of the Translation, there will but little of credit remain to that ancient Writer; only thus much is certain, that those names which still remain in their original sound, are many of them owing, as to their signification, to the true and genuine antiquities of *Moses*, and as the manifest *Anachronisms* which are to be found in those *Phœnician Fables*, for they are no better, are a sufficient confutation to themselves; so on the other hand what there is remaining agreeable to that account of things, which hath been given by *Moses*, is an undeniable attestation to the authority of his Writings, and shows plainly that there have been really such persons and such transactions in the world, as have been left upon record by him.

But whatever becomes of *Abibalus* or *Zabratus*, in the latter of which especially, I am not without great confidence that I am in the right; it is certain that in *Zamolxis*, which was another name for one of *Pythagoras* his Masters, who was, if I am not mistaken, the very same with *Zabratus*, the name of *Jab* is very plainly contained, for this *Zamolxis* is evidently no other than *Jab Moloc*, or the King *Jab*.

For in the first place, as for those among the *Greeks*, who will needs have *Zamolxis* to have been contemporary with *Pythagoras*, and to have been his servant, and to have received his Doctrine from him; this opinion is expressly rejected by *Herodotus* in *Melpomene*, in these words, Δοκίω δὲ πολλοῖσι ἔτισι πέπεισεν ὅτι Ζάμολξον τῶν γενομένων Πυθαγόρου. *I am of opinion that this Zamolxis lived many years before the time of Pythagoras.* In the next place *Museus* in the *Etymologist*, who is transcribed by *Suidas*, saith, that he was worshipped by the *Getae* for *Saturn*; nay, his words are more express, πρὸς Ἰταίῃς ὃν κέλευν τιμᾶσαι καὶ καλεῖσθαι Ζάμολξον, that *Saturn* is worshipped by the *Scythians*, and is called *Zamolxis*; so then *Zamolxis* is evidently *Jab Moloc*, for *Moloc* and *Saturn* have always been accounted the same; and from hence it is that humane sacrifices are offered to *Zamolxis* in *Herodotus*, as well as to *Moloc* by the *Ammonites*, or to *Saturn* or *Jupiter Latiaris* by any other barbarous and heathen Nations; for he tells us, that constantly once in five year they were used to send a *Messenger* to *Zamolxis*, with particular instructions to inform him of what every one wanted, and to desire him to supply their respective wants; and the manner of their sending of him was this, that they were used to fasten three sharp Stakes upon the ground, and then to take their *Messenger*, as they called him, and throw him upon the points of those Stakes; in which case, if he dyed presently,

sently, they took it then for a good Omen, that their requests were granted ; but if he were not presently dispatched, then they were used to say he was a wicked man, and that *Zamolxis* would not receive his *Message*, and so they sent another and another in the same manner, till some one was immediately dispatched, and him they accounted acceptable and well-pleasing to *Zamolxis*; which is a plain sign that this *Messenger*, as *Herodotus* calls him, was looked upon as an *Expiatory sacrifice*, which ought to be clean and pure it self, that it may the better atone for the sins of others. And that this *Zamolxis* is really a word of *Hebrew Origination*, appears still further from this, that as *Herodotus* says, ἐν δὲ αὐτῶν τῶν τοῦτο νομίζουσιν Γεβελειζίν some of the Scythians were used to call him *Gebeleizin*, which is no other than *Gebel* or *Geboul*, in composition with *Zan* or *Zen*, whom the Latines would call *Terminus*, or *Jupiter Terminalis*, and the Greeks δαίμων ἐπιχώρας, as *Herodotus* himself afterwards renders it, εἴτε δὲ ἦναιτο τις Ζάμολξις ἀνθρώπων, εἴτ' ἐστὶ δαίμων τις Γένησι ἐστὶ ἐπιχώρας, χαλκίτα. And so the particular tutelar Deity of the City of *Emissa* in *Phœnicia* was called *Alagabalus*, that is, *Eloah Geboul*, the God of the Coast, or President of that City, and the Territory belonging to it.

But besides this there are several other things, which do very plainly confirm what I have conjectured, that *Jah* and *Zamolxis* are at least so far the same, as that the first is a part of the composition of the latter.

First, It is certain he was not worshipped by any Image or sensible representation, to which they always supposed the Spirit or Divinity of the *Numen* himself to be present ; but they conceived of him, as of an invisible being, having his peculiar residence in heaven ; for which reason the Jews were used to call God *Shamajim*, that is, *Heaven* ; and that not only of latter times, but you may

*Lex. Talmud. in  
Shamajim.*

may see instances of it in *Buxtorf*, out of the *Talmud*, as old as *Shammai*, who lived a good while before our *Saviour*, and in our *Saviour's* time there are many instances of it; that place of *St. Matthew*, where our *Saviour* forbids his disciples to swear by heaven, and that passage of the prodigal son, *Father, I have sinned against heaven, and before thee*; and that *Quære* of our *Saviour's* to the *Priests* and *Elders*, *the baptism of John, whence was it from heaven or of men?* are all very plain examples of this signification; and another instance of it we have likewise in the book of *Daniel*, who lived in the time of the *Babylonish* captivity, c. 4. 26. *After that thou shalt have known that the heavens do rule*; that is, he who hath his more peculiar or beatifque seat in heaven, though by his divine extension he be equally present to all other places besides. For this reason it was, that the *Scythians* did ἀποσταλῆναι ἀγγελον, send a Messenger to him, whom they supposed to have his residence in heaven; and they that dyed were said ἵνασι παρὰ τὸν Ζάμολξιν, to go to *Zamolxis*, which is exactly the language of the Scripture it self: So the Authour to the *Hebrews*, speaking of the Translation of *Enoch*, immediately subjoyns, *He that cometh to God, must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him. Eccles. 12. 7. Then shall the dust return to the earth, as it was, and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it.*

Secondly, The *Scythians* believed of this *Zamolxis*, as the truth was, and as the *Jews* believed, and were obliged to believe of the God of their Fathers, that he was the *Lord*, and that there was none besides him, none that might compare with him in Majesty, Perfection or Power, *Exod. 20. 3. Thou shalt have no other Gods before me*; therefore the *Scythians* were used to shoot up towards heaven, as it were in defiance, when ever it thundred or lightened,



lightened, to show that whatever opinion any other of the *Heathen Nations*, might have of those or any other *Phænomena* of nature, whose causes they could not explain; they themselves notwithstanding had not any other opinion of them, than as of dependent and created things, that had nothing of Self-existence or Divinity in their nature, and could not wound or annoy any thing, whether men or houses, or corn or beasts, but either by chance, or as they were directed by a Superiour power and skill: they are the words of *Herodotus*, ἔτσι δὲ αὐτοὶ Θρηάκας καὶ πρὸς βροντῇ τε καὶ ἀστραπῇ τοξεύοντες ἀνω πρὸς τὸ ὕψος, ἀπειλὴν τῷ Θεῷ ἔδιναν ἄλλω δὲ νόμῳ ζῶντες εἶναι εἰ μὴ τὸ σφόνδεον; that is, and this part of the *Thracians* (that is, the *Getæ*) are used to shoot up towards heaven, when ever it thunders and lightens, threatening and affronting their supposed Divinity, as thinking there is no other God but *Zamolxis*.

This *Zamolxis* therefore was *El heljon*, *Deus ille altissimus*, as the *Socinians* are used to speak in another case, in opposition to all inferiour and dependent Beings, and to all Images, or material representations the works of nature or of art; and it is manifest from this, that these people were not *Idolaters* properly so called, but that they worshipped the true God by his name *Jah*, though after such a manner, as he had not only not appointed, but expressly forbidden by commanding the *Israelites*, that they should not suffer their children to pass through the fire to *Moloch*, as the *Ammonites* were used to do, and by substituting the lives of *Sheep* and *Oxen* to be an expiation for the sins of men; by both of which there is nothing more plain, than that all humane sacrifices were forbidden.

Thirdly, These *Scythians* were zealous assertors of the Doctrine of Transmigration, which the *Greeks* call μεταμύχωςις, and μετεσσωματώσις, and παλυνγυσία, that is,



is, the passing of the same soul thorough several humane bodies; so as after they were gone to *Zamolxis*, that is, dissolved from that body to which they were last united, they returned again into a new Scene or Stage of humane life, to act their parts over again in a new *supposition* or *personality*, consisting of the same soul united to another body.

Fourthly. They did not hold this of all departed souls, but only of those that were good and vertuous, or at least of such as had lived within some tolerable compass of sobriety and duty; both of these are expressly asserted by *Herodotus*, ἀναδιδάσκων (Ζάμολξιν) ὡς ἔτι αὐτός, ἔτι ὡς συμπύτοι αὐτῷ, ἔτι ὡς ὡς τετρίων αὐτῷ χορμῶν ἀποδανίσται, ἀλλ' ἔξουσι εἰς χῆρον τῶτον, ἵνα αὐτῷ περιόντες ἔξουσι τὰ πάντα ἀγαθὰ. that is, it was the Doctrine of *Zamolxis*, that neither he nor his companions or disciples, nor any that were descended from them, should ever dye, but that they should return to the earth again, from whence they were parted, where they should always enjoy all manner of good things.

And in that I have translated συμπύτοι, (which in strictness of speech is those that were used to drink together with him) by his companions, or rather disciples; in this I am warranted both by the thing it self, eating and drinking together being an argument of their being in Covenant with him, and that they were his servants and his followers, which was the meaning of the *peace-offerings* among the *Jews*, of which the Priests, the People and God himself had each of them their share. And I am further confirmed by the words of the *Etymologist*, and *Snidas* out of *Hellanicus* relating the same Story, ὅτι ἔτι αὐτῷ ἀποδάνου, ἔθ' ὡς μετὰ τῶτον, that neither he nor those that were with him should ever dye; those that were with him, that is again, his disciples, ὡς συμπατῶντες, as the *Greeks* would express it, or in the *Hebrew Idiom*, they that walked with God.

Now

Now both of these Doctrines, that is to say, of the Transmigration, and that it belonged only to good men, or at least to such as were comparatively and tolerably so. Both of these, I say, were the Doctrines of the *Pharisees* among the *Jews*, in both of which, because it is unlikely they would have jumped so exactly with one another, if one had not received them from the other; this is another argument that *Zamolxis* is *Jah Moloc*, the name of the true God, whom the *Pharisees* worshipped. *Joseph. Antiq. l. 18. c. 2.* speaking of the *Pharisees*, says thus: Ἀδανὰς τε ἰσχυὸν ταῖς ψυχαῖς πῆς αὐταῖς εἶναι, καὶ ὅτι χροὸς διακρίσεις τε καὶ τιμὰς, εἰς ἀρετῆς ἢ κακίας ἐκτείνουσιν ἐν τῷ βίῳ γίγναι, καὶ ταῖς μὲν εὖ γὰρ μὲν αἰδὶν προτιδεῖν, ταῖς δὲ φαυλοῦ τὴ ἀναβίῳ. They are of opinion that humane souls are of an immortal nature, that the souls of the wicked are punished under ground, and that those of the just are in a state of happiness and reward; and that the first of these are under a perpetual restraint, but the other do easily return to live over the wonted period upon earth again. And in the second book *de bello Judaico*, the same *Authour*, delivers it as the Doctrine of the *Pharisees*, ψυχὴ δὲ πάσων μὲν ἀφθάρτου, μεταβάλλει δὲ εἰς ἕτερον σῶμα τὸν τῶν ἀγαθῶν μόνον. That every soul is immortal, but that only those of the good and vertuous return to live over in another body.

From which places it is plain that the Doctrine of the *Pharisees*, and of the *Scythians*, the Worshippers of *Zamolxis*, was the same; only whereas the *Scythians* seem to have believed that only the souls of the good were immortal, *Josephus* reports it as the Doctrine of the *Pharisees*, that all souls were so; yet since the *ἀδανὰς* in *Herodotus*, is certainly the same with the *ἀναβίως* in *Josephus*, that is, the return of good men into new bodies; this hinders not, but that they are both of them for all this exactly agreed.

And that this was the opinion of the *Jews*, that is, of part of them, for it could not be the Doctrine of the *Sadducees*, who believed there was neither *Angel* nor *Spirit*, is evident from several places of the *Gospels*, *Matth.* 16. 13. *Jesus* puts this question to his disciples, *Whom do men say that I the son of man am?* To which they return this answer, v. 14. *Some say that thou art John the Baptist, some Elias, and others Jeremias, or one of the Prophets;* that is, they supposed the Person of our Saviour, by reason of the Miracles which he wrought, and the admirable Doctrine which he communicated to the world, to be the soul of one of these great and holy men united to that body which they saw. So in the Story of *Nicodemus*, *Joh.* 3. 3. *Jesus* said unto him, *Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born again, he cannot see the Kingdom of God.* V. 4. *Nicodemus* saith unto him, *How can a man be born when he is old? can he enter the second time into his Mothers womb and be born?* And v. 9. *Nicodemus* answered and said unto him, *How can these things be?* To which *Jesus* answered v. 10. *Art thou a Master in Israel, and knowest not these things?* As much as to say, that this was a common thing among the *Jews*, and that our Saviour in describing the regeneration or conversion of a sinner after this manner, did but allude to the received Opinions and Doctrines among themselves; for according to them it was literally true, that a man did really enter into his Mothers womb, in order to being born again. Lastly, *Joh.* 9: 1, 2. *As Jesus* passed by, he saw a man, which was blind from his birth, and his disciples asked him, saying, *Master, who did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?* Which place, though some learned men are pleased to interpret in favour of the Doctrine of *Pre-existence*, in a superiour state, and a more refined, subtle and ætherial body; yet from those testimonies of *Josephus* and of the *Scripture* it self,

self, which I have produced, I think it much more reasonable to interpret it of the Doctrine of *Transmigration* out of one *terrestrial* body into another.

These are the reasons that persuade me to believe the *Zamolxis* of the *Getae* to be a composition of *Jab* and *Moloc* together, and consequently are a confirmation of *Pythagoras* his either immediate, or at least oblique and secondary acquaintance with the *Jews*; and I do humbly conceive, that what I have said upon this occasion is so plain, and so demonstrative, that it carries its own evidence along with it; and will therefore, as I presume to hope, give all the satisfaction, which an enquiry of this nature can afford to learned men. But notwithstanding this, it is to be confessed, that *Porphyrie* gives another *Etymon* of this so celebrated and famous name, which I shall now produce to show the unskillfulness of *Porphyrie*, and the insufficiency of his conjecture; which instead of doing any disadvantage or disparagement to mine, shall but further recommend it to the good opinion of every judicious and impartial Reader: the words of *Porphyrie* then are these, *ὡς δ' αὐτῷ καὶ ἑταρὸν μωροῦ-κτον, ὃς καὶ Θεῶν ἐκτίσται ὃ Ζάμολξις ὡς ἑομα, ἐπεὶ γινώ-σκειν αὐτῷ δορὲς ἀρκτε ἐπιβλήθη, τὴν γὰρ δορὲν ἐς Θεῶ-κας Ζαλμὸν καλῶσιν.* That is, *he (Pythagoras) had another boy, whom he bought in Thrace, whose name was Zamolxis, which name was given him; for that immediately after he was born, he was wrapped up in a Bears skin, for the skin of any beast is by the Thracians called Zalmos.*

If this conjecture be true, as I shall demonstrate it to be false, then it ought to be read in the Copies of *Porphyrie*, not *Zamolxis*; but *Zalmoxis*, as it is *de facto* in some MSS. of *Herodotus*, and of the Citations out of him of *Aeneas Gazeus*, and of *Eustathius* in his *Scholiasse* upon *Dionysius Alexandrinus*, commonly called *ὁ περιηγη-τής*. *Aldobrandinus* in his notes upon *Laertius*, at least

as I have seen it in the *London* Edition, citing this place of *Porphyrie*, calls it Ζαμλός, which is certainly false, for *Zaimos* is *vox nihili*, a word of no signification; and though *Zalmos* be the true reading of *Porphyrie*, as appears by all those Copies of divers Authours, that reade the name pretended to be derived from it, *Zalmoxis*; yet I conceive it is not the true word of the *Scythians* themselves, who (bating the instance of *Zamolxis*, which being now the matter in dispute, must not be drawn into argument either way) by what hath been said of the word *Gebelism*, appear to have had no small tang of *Hebraism* among them; but the true word, as I conceive, is *Zamlos*, for *Semilah* in *Hebrew* signifies any garment, and we know the first garments, after fig-leaves, were made of leather, Gen. 3. 21. Which might be the reason why *Semilah* among the *Scythians* might answer to *δοξ*, or by mistake it might be so interpreted by one who had the Story of *Genesis* in his mind, which sort of mistakes do very often happen among unskillfull men; but yet I will not absolutely deny, but there might possibly be a *Metathesis* in the case, and that what the *Hebrews* called *Semilah*, the *Getae* might call *Selimah* or *Salmah*, as *Οζος* and *Οζος* in *Greek* are the same; and what the *Hebrew* calls *Chetoneth*, and the *Greek* χιτων, is *Tunica* in *Latin*, though I rather conceive that to be à *tuendo*, because it defends us from the injuries of the weather, and so all the *Films* and *Membranes* of the Eye are by *Anatomists* called *Tunica*, still à *tuendo* from guarding and protecting the *Pupil*, about which they are spread.

But supposing this to be indeed a *Scythian* or *Hebrew* word, which yet is improbable, because such a signification of *Selimah*, would confound it with the root of *Shallem* or *Shalom*, by which all manner of *peace* and *prosperity* is denoted; and supposing this to be the true signification, which *Porphyrie* hath assigned, yet by what

what Analogy shall we be able to come at the whole word *Salmoxis*; for my part I do not understand it, and I believe it would puzzle a better *Grammarians* than I pretend to be.

Again, *Suidas* tells us, Ζάμολξις Ἰνδύκῃς, ἱεροῖα θεᾶς, *Zamolxis in the Feminine gender is the name of a Goddess. And how? was this Goddess too wrapped in a Bears skin. Ἀρεῖ!*

*Auditum admitti risum teneatis.*

*Zamolxis* therefore, or rather *Zamolxos*, as the *Etymologist* reads it, is *Jab Moloc*; and *Zamolxis* is, *Juno Regina*, ὅπερ εἶναι δεῖται.

But in the Story of *Pythagoras*, there is not only mention of *Zabratus* and *Zamolxis*, but also of *Charondas* and *Zaleucus*. *Porphyrie*, Καὶ νόμους εἰπετο διὰ Χαρῶνδρα τῷ Κατανέῳ καὶ Ζαλεῦκῳ τῷ Λοκρῷ, *He (Pythagoras) gave Laws (to several people their named) by the hands, or by the Ministry of Charondas the Catanean, and of Zaleucus of Locris.* Now if a man consider with himself, what hath been said of *Zabratus* and *Zamolxis*, and that the latter of these, notwithstanding that by the ignorance of the *Greek Writers*, he is made Contemporary with *Pythagoras* himself, and represented as his servant and his disciple; yet in the opinion of *Herodotus*, who is in this confirmed by the *Etymologist* and by *Suidas*, he is much ancients than *Pythagoras* his time; the truth of which appears likewise by the most likely *Etymon* of his name, and by other concurrent circumstances which I have carefully set down; I say, he that shall consider this, and that *Charondas* and *Zaleucus* may both of them be very plausibly reduced to the *Hebrew Jab*, may not absurdly conclude, notwithstanding that these two last named are made contemporary with *Pythagoras*, as well as *Zamolxis* was, that yet they are much ancients.



enter as well as he; and that all of these, *Zabratius*, *Abibalus*, *Zamolxis*, *Gebelizin*, *Charondas* and *Zaleucus* are the same, being only so many several *indigitamenta* of the same *Polygonymous Numen*, which was a certain indication of the Majesty and Greatness of the Divinity in it self, and of the respect which it received from its Worshipers and Servants, according to that of *Callimachus*.

Δὲς μοι παρθενίῳ αἰνῶνι, Ἄππα, φυλάσσειν  
καὶ πολυνυμῶν ———

From which place Mr. *Selden* will needs interpret that reprehension of the *Pharisees* by our *Saviour*, that thought they should be heard for their much speaking, διὰ τὸ πολυλογεῖν, as if it were to be understood of this πολυνυμῶν, by repeating over a bed-roll of all the names of God in Scripture, such as are *El*, *Eloah*, *Elohim*, *Saddai*, *Sabaoth*, *Adonai*, *Jehvoh* and *Ehjoh*; but with due respect to the Memory and Authority of so great a man as Mr. *Selden*, I am not of his opinion, for the *Pharisees* are manifestly reprehended by our *Saviour* for the affected length of their Prayers, in which they are unhappily imitated by their successors of this hypocritical age into which we are fallen. Now it being manifest that all the names of God in Scripture, though repeated several times over, would make but a very short prayer; nothing can be more plain, than that Mr. *Selden's* is but a fanci-  
full interpretation of the place.

But to return to the consideration of *Charondas* and *Zaleucus*: And first for *Charondas*, *Charondas* may be *Jab Haran*, the God of *Haran*, Χαρίαν the 70 call it, and that the Heathen World had some knowledge of that *Vision* of the *Ladder*, which might give occasion to this name, hath been seen above in what hath been said concerning the βασιλεία in *Hesychius*,

*chius*, and *Das* the termination of *Charondas*, answers to the *Hebrew Jah*, from whence is the *Greek Γῆ* or *Γᾶ* supposed to be the ancientest of all the Gods, and the parent of them all; and that *Γᾶ* and *Δᾶ* are the same, appears in *δαΐπιδος*, *δυμήτης*, *δαΐσιος*, *ἀλλοδαπός*, *ἐχθροδαπός*, *ποδαπός*, and other instances which I have mentioned in other Papers, and will not transcribe them hither. So much for *Charondas*; and for *Zaleucus*, what can be more like than *Zaleucus*, and *Jah Louchoth*, that is, *Dens Tabularum*, with respect to the Commandments which were written upon *Tables of Stone* by the finger of God himself, which *Tables* in *Hebrew* are properly called *Louchoth*, and it may seem that *Pythagoras* consulted these, in that those *Golden Verses* that go under his name, and are to be sure very consonant to his Sentiments, though they are supposed to have been written by *Phocylides* long after his time, begin with the worship of God, and afterwards enjoin reverence to an Oath, and paying the respect and honour due to Parents.

But I only mention these two last instances to shew what care ought to be taken of Etymologies, and how deceitfull the prettiest conjectures may be, when all things are not considered; for the unanimous consent of *Greek* and *Latin* Writers forbid us to think otherwise, but that there were indeed such humane persons as *Charondas* and *Zaleucus*, that they lived in the age of *Pythagoras*, and at those places which *Porphyrus* hath mentioned; the one in *Locris*, in that corner of *Italy*, which was anciently called *Magna Græcia*, the other in *Sicily*, in or about that place which even at this day goes by the name of *Catanea*, where the late dreadfull eruption of the *Volcano's* happened: and the true Analogy of both those names is this; as from *ἐπαμίνω*, or *ἐπαμίνων*, is *Epaminondas*; so from *χαίρω*, or *χαλῶν*, is *Charondas*; and *Zaleucus*

*Zalencus* is as much as *διὰ λευκῶν*, that is, the Latin *Albius* or *Albinus*, the French *Le Blanc*, the Italian *Bianchi*, and the English *White*; so the *Etymologist*, *Ἀπολόγιστος*, τὸ διὰ *Za* παρ', the *Eolique* Dialect expresseth the *Preposition* διὰ by *Za*· and though I was once of the mind for another reason, besides, that it will favour my conjecture, or rather demonstration, that the *Hebrew* *Jah*, and the *Greek* *Zā* are the same, viz. to avoid a very fulsome tautology in the *Etymologist*, that this place ought rather to be read, with a very light mutation, *Ἀπολόγιστος* τὸ διὰ *Za* παρ'· yet since I have altered my mind, not onely because my conjecture needs it not, but because the oblique case in any instance that I can think of is never a part of the composition in the *Greek* tongue, unless it be the genitive, of which there are examples, *μυθεῖσθαι* καὶ ταῦτα μὲν δε ταῦτα.

---

## F I N I S.

---

The order of the Pages for the direction of the Book-Binder.

*Page* 191 to 199, the reverse of which is marked 316, and goes on in order to 341, which ends the first *Exercitation*. The second begins at a blank Page, and goes on 200, 201, in order to 211, the reverse of which is 248, and goes on in order to 312, which is the end of the second.

Authours cited, refuted, vindicated or explained in the three Exercitationes.

A.

*Aben Ezra.*  
*Ælianus.*  
*Æneas Gazeus.*  
*Aldobrandinus.*  
*Anthologia.*  
*Apollonius, & ejus Scholiast.*  
*Aristophanes, & ejus Sch. vet.*  
*Aristoteles.*  
*Athenæus.*  
*Augustinus.*

B.

*Baronius.*  
*Beresbith Rabba.*  
*Biblia secundum veritatem*  
*Hebraicam ex versione*  
*ꝛꝑ o. Aquilæ, Symmachi,*  
*Theodotionis, quintæ Editi-*  
*onis, Targumim, Medra-*  
*shim.*

*Bochartus.*  
*Brodæus.*  
*Busbequius.*  
*Buxtorfus.*

C.

*Capellus Ludovicus.*  
*Casaubonus Isaacus.*  
*Catullus.*  
*Chrysostomus.*  
*Clarius.*  
*Clemens Alexandrinus.*

*Cloppenburgius.*  
*Cockins.*  
*Dr. Covell.*  
*Cowleius.*  
*Dr. Cudworth.*  
*Cyrillus.*

D.

*Diodorus.*  
*Dionysius, { Alexandrinus.*  
*{ Halicarnassensis.*  
*Drusus.*

E.

*Epicharmus.*  
*Epiphanus.*  
*Etymologus.*  
*Ensebius.*  
*Eustathius.*

F.

*Fagius.*  
*Florus.*

G.

*Gianbari, Scriptor Arab.*  
*Bocharto laudatus.*  
*Glossæ veteres.*  
*Gregorius Nazianzenus.*  
*Grotius.*

H.

*Heinsius Daniel.*  
*Hellanicus.*  
*Herodotus.*  
*Hesiodus.*

*Hesychius.*

*Hesychius.*  
*Hieronymus.*  
*Holstenius.*  
*Homerus, & ejus Schol. vet.*  
*Horatius.*

I.

*Josephus.*  
*Irenæus.*

*Isidorus.* { *Hispalensis.*  
*Pelusiota.*

*Iustinus.*  
*Juvenalis.*

L.

*Dr. Lightfoot.*  
*Livius.*  
*Livellus.*  
*Lucianus.*

M.

*Macrobius.*  
*Maimonides.*  
*Mafius.*  
*Menagius.*  
*Minucius.*  
*Mishnaitoth.*  
*Mnaseas.*  
*Munsterus.*

O.

*Origenes.*  
*Orpheus.*  
*Ovidius.*

P.

*Petitus Samuel.*  
*Pherecydes Syrius.*  
*Philastrinus.*

*Philo* { *Byblius.*  
*Judæus.*

*Philostrophus.*

*Philoxenus.*

*Phocylides.*

*Pindarus, & ejus vetus in-*  
*terpres.*

*Plato.*

*Plantus.*

*Plutarchus.*

*Porphyrius.*

*Priscianus.*

*Procopius.*

*Propertius.*

*Pythagoras.*

S.

*Salmasius.*

*Sanchuniathon.*

*Scaliger Josephus.*

*Seldenus.*

*Seneca.*

*Suidas.*

T.

*Tertullianus.*

*Theodoretus.*

*Scriptor Libri, Toledoth*  
*Jeshu.*

V.

*Vossius* { *Dionysius.*  
*Isaacus.*

X.

*Xenophon.*

Z.

*Zegerus.*

*Places*

*Places of Scripture cited, vindicated and explained in the three Exercitations.*

<i>Genesis,</i>	I. 14. XI. 3. XVI. 2. XVII. 12. XXIV. 1, 2, 3, 4. XXX. 3. XLVI. 26. XLVII. 29, 30, 31. XLIX. 10. L. 6, 8, 11, 13, 23.	<i>2 Chron.</i> XXXIV. 13. <i>Nehemiah,</i> VIII. 1, 2. <i>Psal.</i> XVII. 8. XIX. 5. XLV. 3. LXVIII. 4. LXIX. 34. CIX. 13. <i>Eccles.</i> XII. 7. <i>Isaiah,</i> I. 13. XXXVI. 15.
<i>Exodus,</i>	I. 5. II. 10. III. 23. VI. 3. XII. 16. XX. 22. XXIII. 16. XXX. 32, 33, 37, 38. XXXII. 32, 33. XXXIV. 24.	<i>Daniel,</i> IV. 26. <i>Nahum,</i> III. 14. <i>Malachy,</i> II. 4, 7, 8. <i>1 Machab.</i> V. 42. <i>Matthew,</i> VI. 7. XVI. 14. XXI. 25. XXVI. 2, 5, 17, 18.
<i>Leviticus,</i>	XXII. 27. XXIII. 15, 16. XXV. 31.	<i>Mark,</i> VII. 22. XIV. 12. <i>Luke,</i> IV. 20. XV. 18. XXII. 7.
<i>Numbers,</i>	V. 21.	<i>John,</i> III. 10. IX. 1, 2. XIII. 1, 2, 29. XVIII. 28. XIX. 14, 31.
<i>Deuteron.</i>	XI. 18, 19, 20. XVI. 7, 18. XVII. 18.	<i>Acts.</i> XIX. 35. <i>1 Corinth.</i> V. 7. <i>Hebrews.</i> XI. 6.
<i>Judges,</i>	III. 16, 21.	
<i>2 Samuel,</i>	XI. 1. XXII. 11.	
<i>1 Chron.</i>	XX. 1.	

F I N I S.



Place of origin of the specimens

1992

[illegible]

10-11-68

De V. 10  
Il. 14

... ..

1000

471

1942

177

100